THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. IX NOVEMBER, 1924 No. 53

EDITORIAL

We published last month a review of Dr. Coulton's *Five Centuries of Religion*, written (as the reviewer candidly said) "from a point of view almost wholly homiletical"; and we believe that neither he, nor the author of the book, nor our readers will take it amiss if we draw attention to the subject again and from a somewhat different angle. Professor Baxter has assured us indeed that he has no objection to such a supplement; Dr. Coulton is preparing a second volume in continuation of that before us, and will probably welcome any temperate criticisms of his first; while our readers will certainly not repent it, if this double dose of comment should stimulate them to buy the book for themselves. For it is a book worth possessing. Whatever we may think of some of the historical judgments in it, it is a veritable mine of diversified information, well illustrated, well documented, and well written; and such things are always to be valued.

Dr. Coulton has written his book under a sense of danger. He is convinced that the Church of to-day is in grave peril of being seduced into false ways by wholly fictitious ideas as to what the Middle Ages were like. The pictures drawn by Mr. Chesterton, Mr. Belloc, and other writers, both Roman and Anglican, of the "Ages of Faith," "Merrie England," and the like, in contrast with the dour and loveless ages which have followed the Reformation, have led large sections of religious opinion—so Dr. Coulton thinks—to cast longing eyes back to those halcyon days and to aim at reviving many of the mediæval superstitions and abuses. The desire to stay this popular tendency is one of his motives in writing. Not that he is by any means a controversialist *pur simple*. His aim is rather to produce such an exhaustive picture of mediæval popular religion that the controversial pens of others will be silenced. That

is always the most effective, because the most justifiable, form of controversy. And we should not be prepared to say that it is unneeded. Undoubtedly there has been a deal of romancing about the Middle Ages. All that Umbria stands for—Francis, Giotto, Dante, Fra Angelico—exercises a spell which the imagination very readily extends to the whole system of life and thought of which they and their generations seem to have been part.

At the same time Dr. Coulton's outlook has its own dangers. We agree with his main criticism of those who cry up mediæval religion: but how far have they really influenced the Catholicism of to-day? We make bold to say that it is a very superficial judgment which regards the modern Anglo-Catholic movement, for instance, as an attempt to revive mediævalism. It is not the mediæval, but the post-Tridentine, Roman Church in Europe which attracts men to-day; and, as Dr. Coulton well knows (p. 26), there is a world of difference between them. Indeed, we should be prepared to say that the first essential of any modern philosophy of ecclesiastical history is a recognition that the modern Church of Rome is a reformed Church. Its reformation proceeded on different lines, and was guided by different principles, from ours; and the stereotyping of these during three centuries is what makes the problem of Reunion with Rome one of such infinite difficulty. But we shall not make progress until we familiarize ourselves with the idea that the Counter-Reformation was as much a real fact of history—both for better and for worse—as the Reformation. That is our first point of preliminary criticism. The second is this. There runs throughout Dr. Coulton's estimate of the Middle Ages an assumption of the essential moral and religious healthiness of our present condition which needs—to say the least—to be made good. Suppose we were to submit the society of the last two or three centuries in Europe to the same microscopic examination as that which Dr. Coulton employs upon the early Middle Ages; suppose we were to quote every utterance of reforming Churchmen as evidence for the moral and religious condition of their time; suppose we were really to bring to light the worldliness and love of comfort, the secularity of aim and outlook, the strange and often cruel ideas of God which have from time to time flourished in Protestant societies—suppose we compare, for instance, Hawthorne's immortal story of *The Scarlet Letter* with the sermons of Herolt, or the sculptures of Bourges Cathedral; then, indeed, could we really be so sure that we are in a position to throw stones? We are convinced that the majority of thinking men to-day answer in

the negative. No doubt the discovery of an adequate criterion of historical judgment is a task of formidable complexity; we wish that Dr. Coulton's book had revealed him as more clearly aware how formidable and how complex it is.

A very competent reviewer of Dr. Coulton's book, Professor Powicke, Litt.D., writing in our contemporary, *History*, asks: "Whence comes this uneasy atmosphere of overwrought emotion?" We suggest that it comes precisely from these uncriticized assumptions which underlie the controversial element in the book. We may illustrate it from one of the favourite charges which Dr. Coulton brings against the Middle Ages—that of "materialism."

> At bottom (he writes) that was a more materialistic age than ours, as might naturally be expected; civilization, however slowly it may work, does bring an increased power of rising from the concrete to the abstract. The sceptical emperor, Frederick II., thought to disprove the existence of the human soul by shutting a man up in a hermetically sealed cask. No soul was found with the corpse when the cask was opened, there was no rift or point through which a soul could have escaped; therefore there is no such factor in human life.

Dr. Coulton has hardly been happy in his instance, seeing that an almost identical argument for the soul's non-existence is contained in the celebrated dictum of La Place, which has done duty on a thousand platforms of modern Rationalism. But, that apart, in what sense is the "concrete" more spiritual, or less materialistic, than the "abstract"? Or, again, Dr. Coulton writes of early mediæval art:

> The Church, by dint of emphasizing the things that appealed visibly to simple folk, gradually materialized her doctrines (p. 55).

Do we "materialize" the eternal verities, then, when we try to make them real to the mind and imagination by means of art? Plato at least did not think so, nor Milton, nor Bach. We are not surprised that, with such notions of "materialism" in his mind, Dr. Coulton should regard the doctrine of Transubstantiation as a crowning instance of it. But even here he would have done well to have considered the judgment of so avowedly Protestant a theologian as Dr. Hatch, that that doctrine was "the most purely spiritual doctrine of the Eucharist ever invented."

To this criticism of Dr. Coulton as a philosopher must be added two which concern more nearly his method as a historian, and in particular his use of evidence. With every desire to avoid being captious towards a work of such erudition as this, we cannot forbear saying that over and over again in these

pages we find Dr. Coulton quoting evidence which lies outside, and often far outside, his period. The period which forms the subject of this volume runs roughly from A.D. 500 to 1200—from Benedict to Bernard. Yet Dr. Coulton frequently reinforces his argument by facts culled from the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries, as though they belonged to the period under discussion. A particularly glaring case occurs in the third chapter. This chapter is entitled, "The Monk's God"; and we confess to having experienced a certain disgust when we discovered that the subject of the chapter was in fact the devil. Satire needs careful use if it is to be the handmaid of history. But let that pass. Dr. Coulton's purpose in this chapter is to give some account of the background of demonology in the religious beliefs of the age immediately preceding St. Benedict. Yet nearly half of the chapter (pp. 35-44) is devoted to long citations from the discourses of a thirteenth-century Cistercian abbot named Richalm! We do not doubt that Richalm was desperately superstitious; but we cannot see what this has to do with St. Benedict or his predecessors.

The second point is of more general bearing. Perhaps the chief evidence on which Dr. Coulton relies for the degradation of religion in his period is the vigorous criticism of it found in the writings of those who set themselves to the work of reform. Such evidence needs very cautious handling. On the one hand, it must be remembered that the reformers themselves belong to the age whose corruptions they expose; and the fact that they spoke as they did must be remembered, when we try to estimate the moral condition of the time. These reforming voices had antecedents and won followers; the candle of the Lord was never snuffed, so long as such witness was borne; and the very outspokenness of their criticisms is at least a sign that the policy of glozing over wickedness, for fear folk should be shocked, was not (shall we say ?) more common then than now. On the other hand, the testimony of these reformers needs itself to be sifted. Reformers always see evil in its blackest colours; paint it at its worst to rouse righteousness to action; strain every nerve to make the moral issues plain. Only so did Arnold cleanse the Public Schools, Wilberforce abolish the Slave Trade, Kingsley awaken the social conscience of the Church. We cannot think that Dr. Coulton is prepared to accept at their face value the pictures of English religion in the eighteenth century with which the Tractarians drove home their message. He would say (unless we are much mistaken) that things were not so bad as they were painted. We agree: but is not the same caution necessary in dealing with a Bernard or a Cæsarius of Heisterbach ?

We trust that none of our readers will surmise from this criticism that Dr. Coulton is unable to appreciate the mediæval Church. We believe that he has set out to prove too much: but none the less he has proved a great deal. He has shattered the dreams of any who supposed that progress in religion to-day was to be found in a return to the Middle Ages, or that they were in any sense a "Golden Age" of the Church. He has shown that the five centuries he treats of were plagued by superstitions and moral abuses which we may be very thankful that the Church has outgrown. He has made to stand out in magnificent power and beauty the character and work of St. Bernard—and this reinstatement alone would entitle *Five Centuries of Religion* to rank as a great historical work. And, finally, in this very chapter on Clairvaux he has done that which perhaps he never intended—he has shown the monastic life to be at its best so singular in its witness to God and so powerful in its influence on men's souls that we may fairly regard it as an indispensable feature of any true Christian society.

The letter from Dr. Gore which we print below makes it necessary that we should again draw attention to the long interval which elapsed between the publication of Mr. Baker's two articles in May and October severally. For that we are solely responsible, and must express our regret, pleading only that pressure on space makes alteration of plan sometimes inevitable. In this case the result was to remove Mr. Baker's second article far from the covering paragraph [May, p. 247] of the whole study, which made clear his method. His method was definitely that of putting a case at its strongest and seeing what results. Concede, he says, for the sake of argument, the extreme position of Bousset and Reitzenstein—viz., that St. Paul preached Christianity as a mystery religion; carry it even further, and suppose that even our Lord Himself proclaimed a Christian mystery; and then weigh its effect on "our theory of Catholic faith and practice." As Mr. Baker made it so clear that this was his method, we did not think it essential to ask the very pertinent question which Dr. Gore asks. We agree entirely with Dr. Gore that in point of evidence the case is emphatically "not proven." Mr. Baker's criticism is rather that it is "not thorough," and that whatever evidence may lead men to say that St. Paul preached a Christian "mystery" must also lead them to say that our Lord did the same. This is an *argumentum ad hominem* which we think may fairly be considered.

THE DIVINE UNITY*

The Lord hath said, I will bring my people again, as I did from Basan; mine own will I bring again, as I did sometime from the deep of the sea; that thy foot may be dipped in the blood of thine enemies, and that the tongue of thy dogs may be red through the same.—*Ps.* lxviii. 22.

When we speak of Trinity Sunday, or of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, we are using an abbreviated phrase, expressing only the half of our meaning. What we refer to is the doctrine of Trinity in Unity, and Unity is certainly not the least important part of it. For the sake of this the doctrine was formulated. Christians had learnt from the first to worship Christ as God; the very name of Christian, given to them, as you will remember, at Antioch, probably meant precisely a worshipper of Christ. This was their distinctive mark. The greater part of the world had no difficulty about it; Gods many and Lords many were familiar objects of worship. To worship God the Father Almighty, and to worship Christ as God the Son, was quite in the ordinary way of religion. But for a Jew this was terrible; and the firm belief in the one only God, which the Jewish people had learnt with infinite difficulty from their prophets, was the doctrinal inheritance of the Christian Church. It was therefore necessary to find out how this belief could be reconciled with the practice of worshipping God the Father and Jesus Christ as God. This enquiry led to the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity.

It was, in fact, much more difficult to believe in one only God than to worship many Gods. It remains more difficult. I do not mean that we are inclined to profess belief in many Gods. An ingrained habit prevents us from doing that. I am thinking of what lies behind our professed belief. The world is so various that we can more easily refer it to a great variety of causes than to one God the Creator of all. At all events it is easy to stop short of God, and content ourselves with thinking of various independent causes. The persistent belief in chance illustrates this; the Roman goddess Fortuna has many votaries to-day. An exact philosophy can give good reasons for believing in one only God the Creator, but most of us are not philosophers; so far as we do believe in the one God, we take the truth on trust. There is no harm in that, if we do take it. But do we? Is there not sometimes at the back of your mind a sort of belief in one God, the maker of the world, and in another God who is the Saviour of men?

* A sermon preached by Canon Lacey at Worcester Cathedral on the First Sunday after Trinity.

St. Paul said that you can know the one God from his works: "The invisible things of Him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even His eternal power and deity." I am sure that is true, if you give your mind to it. But the Apostle complains that men are unwilling to give their minds to it, with results which you may read in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. Most of us will not take the trouble to be such philosophers as we might be. And if you do give your mind to it, if you learn from the various works of the Lord that they are indeed the work of one God, the Father Almighty, are you at the end of your trouble? The world is full of a strange diversity of creatures, and you may be bewildered. You are a Christian, and you have learnt, more or less, to think of God as Jesus Christ thought. Then you find, in the world which God has made, things which seem utterly at variance with these thoughts; cruelty, and suffering wantonly inflicted, hardness and cold indifference. You may have heard it said that "Nature never forgives," and you find it almost always true; the consequences of wrong-doing, and still more of folly, have to be endured. How does this agree with the kindness and mercy of God that you read about in the Gospel? Does it not seem that the God of Nature must be one God, and the God of Jesus Christ another God?

There is a further difficulty. The God of the Old Testament seems to be one God, and the God of Jesus Christ another God. Take those verses of a psalm which I have just read, the psalm used on Whit-Sunday. What do they mean? There are mystical interpretations of great beauty, but we must not let these blind us to the plain literal sense. The English version does not give you the whole horror of that sense. It is a description of panic in battle, with its awful consequences, and God is said to cause that panic, in order that his chosen people may wade through merciless slaughter of their enemies, while their dogs lap up the blood of the slain. Some people think that we ought not to read such words in Church; but to leave them out in reading would not alter the fact that they are there, and similar passages are found everywhere in the Old Testament. Then shall we give up the Old Testament altogether and confine ourselves to the New Testament? Does the Old Testament give us a false impression about God? It is old, of course, and much of it has been swept away by the New Testament. But is that the case with these terrible passages about the works of God the Creator? No; for the same things are still being done on a vast scale. We believe that God the Creator does these things, not because we read about them in the Old Testament, but because we see them being done before our own eyes. We

have seen men dipping their feet in the blood of their enemies. But these are the works of man, you may say, not the works of God. Then what of a great earthquake, which kills men, women and children, by the hundred thousand? That is not a work of man. Neither is war, with all its horrors, altogether a work of man. God has so made the world that the wickedness of men brings suffering upon countless numbers of the innocent. And not wickedness only, but also folly. If you play the fool, you have to take the consequences, and they often fall upon others as well as yourself. God has so made the world that war, with all its horrors, is sometimes the inevitable consequence, not only of the wickedness, but also of the folly and stupidity of men. You may say with truth that God orders it. That is also what the Old Testament says.

Does it seem contrary to what we learn about God in the New Testament? Then are we to believe in two Gods, the God of Nature and the God of Grace, revealed by Jesus Christ in the Gospel? Is it quite clear that there is this strong contrast between nature and grace, between the Old Testament and the Gospel? Let us see.

On one side it is not quite true to say that Nature never forgives. There are natural mercies. Wickedness and folly bring suffering, but sometimes the suffering is remedial. Nature has a way of rectifying your mistakes. You may spoil the countryside with artificial hideousness, but in time Nature will undo your work, and restore the beauty that you have destroyed. That is only an illustration, a parable, but it may lead you towards the truth.

On the other side, there are some very hard sayings in the Gospel. You will find them in the Sermon on the Mount. For a contemptuous word you may be "in danger of the hell of fire." If you will not give your brother his due, you may be cast into prison, and "thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing." You must be ready to make cruel sacrifices, an eye or a limb, "For it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body be cast into hell." You are to be treated as you treat others; "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you." There is widespread ruin: "Wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many be they that enter in thereby. Narrow is the gate, and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life, and few be they that find it." There is stern judgment: "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire."

There is the same teaching in parables; the wedding guest, not properly clad, is cast into outer darkness, where is weeping

and gnashing of teeth; the foolish virgins, for their mere carelessness, are irrevocably shut out from the marriage feast; the rich man in hell is refused the least alleviation of his torment.

But beyond all there is the scene of Gethsemane; the Beloved Son, His soul exceeding sorrowful even unto death, prostrate in agony of prayer: "Father, all things are possible unto Thee; take away this cup from Me: nevertheless not what I will, but what Thou wilt." So it was the will of God the Father that Jesus the Beloved Son should die in torment on the Cross. Our difficulties do not lie in a contrast between Nature and Grace, between the Old Testament and the Gospel; they are found within the Gospel. It is God the Father, revealed by Jesus Christ in the Gospel, who does these things. If He is our Father, He is certainly a stern Father. That truth lies behind the most comforting words of the Gospel. "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father." Yes; but sparrows do fall on the ground to perish miserably; and so do men who are of more value than many sparrows. There is not one God who kills sparrows and another God who saves men from their sins, nor yet a third God who puts all holy and beautiful thoughts into your heart: but these three are One God.

THE PROBLEM OF PENTECOST

THE problem caused by the narrative of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost is mainly twofold. First, the question arises how the Holy Spirit can be said to have "come" then, since He has been operative in the world from the beginning of the creation? Secondly, what exactly is the significance of the *glossolalia*? It is our purpose to attempt to show that the answer to the latter question also provides the answer to the former, as indeed it might be naturally expected to do.

Let us turn, then, to the *glossolalia*. What are the facts of the case? We find the small body of believers gathered together in a state of keen expectancy. They had been told by the Lord that they were to receive the Holy Spirit "not many days hence"; and this Day of Pentecost on which they were gathered together was traditionally regarded as the anniversary of the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai. They would, therefore, *a priori* expect something to happen to-day. Suddenly there was a wonderful vision (ὤφθησαν), a vision of sound and sight, if the expression may be allowed, a vision which evidently

harked back to the account of the wonderful happenings on Sinai. For wind and fire were the traditional symbols of the Spirit's operations. And they began to speak ἑτέραις γλώσσαις. It is worth while to enquire who exactly it was who spoke. It is commonly supposed that the whole body of believers did so. But a careful examination of the narrative makes it more probable that it was only the Apostles themselves. This is borne out by the fact that when St. Peter stood up to defend the speakers from the charge of drunkenness, the rest of the Apostles stood up with him, and he evidently pointed to them in the course of his remarks. This is scarcely likely if they had all spoken. Moreover, would the crowd which ran together have said, " Are not all these which speak Galileans ?" in reference to a mixed body of 120 persons ? But to refer to the Apostles in this way would be quite natural. We conclude, therefore, that it was the Apostles only who spoke with tongues. We shall see that, if this be the case, then it harmonizes more naturally with the theory which we wish to put forward. One further remark must be made about the actual narrative. The list of names in verses 9-11 must be regarded as an editorial explanation, and not as part of the utterances of the crowd at the time. In this case, it is no indication as to exactly what languages were spoken in the " tongues "; for it is probable that St. Luke when he wrote did not have any very clear understanding of what happened.

How, then, are we to explain the happenings of that great day ? And when we speak of an explanation, be it always remembered that we are thinking only of the human side of the scene. There is no suggestion that the Prime Mover is not God. Rather, as we shall see, it is necessary to posit the activity of God as a *vera causa*. On the other hand, psychology as such (and it is largely a psychological question surely), like any other science, knows nothing of God. It can only feel after Him; it can never demonstrate Him.

The theory which we wish to put forward is that the speaking with " tongues " was due to the sudden breaking down of a repression in the unconscious minds of the Apostles. It will be remembered by those acquainted with modern psychology that the word " repression " is used by writers in two different senses. There is the sense in which Freud uses it, by which it applies to psychical material (if the expression is permissible) which is entirely submerged in the unconscious, and beyond the reach of the conscious mind. There is also the sense in which the late Dr. Rivers used it to refer to psychical material below the level of consciousness, but at the same time to some extent within the control of the intelligence. That is to say, at times it is below consciousness, and at others it can be brought up and faced.

Rivers used the term "suppression" to denote what Freud means by "repression." But repressed material, according to Rivers, which of course is always of a kind to be painful to the conscious mind, "is yet capable of recall without any special difficulty, and is able to produce nightmares and other morbid symptoms which may in other cases depend on the activity of experience which has been suppressed" (*Instinct and the Unconscious*, p. 126).

A further distinction between the two processes is that repression takes place by a conscious effort, whereas suppression is an entirely unconscious and as it were automatic process. Our intention here is to use the word "repression" as Rivers used it, and not in the more popular sense of Freud. We say, then, that the speaking with "tongues" was due to certain repressed experience rushing forth into consciousness. Is there any indication in the New Testament as to what this would be? Surely the answer is not doubtful. It was in the first instance our Lord's announcement that He was to die a violent death. We know that from the very first the disciples repudiated this suggestion with horror, as was perfectly natural. And on top of the shock caused by the first intimation of the Lord's death came the painful experience in which He was constrained to call St. Peter "Satan." It was an awful experience for them, and we know that they were overcome with fear. For we read that when our Lord again introduced the subject they were afraid to ask Him about it (Mark ix. 31 and 32 and parallels). And then let us try to imagine what the effect must have been when the Crucifixion actually took place. We hardly realize in any measure, owing to our extreme familiarity with the narrative, what an appalling shock the whole thing must have given to the Apostles. It would, indeed, be surprising if they did not have some nightmares at that time. It is true that on Easter Day the whole scene was irradiated with a heavenly glory; and we can see a reflection of the effect Easter had on their minds in the first words of St. Peter's first epistle, where he speaks of being begotten again to a living hope by the Resurrection. But we have to remember that though the Cross was conquered it was not understood. It was still something to be banished from the mind, a horrible incident which should for ever be forgotten. That the little community had no idea of the real significance of the suffering Messiah still, is clear from the account we have of our Lord's conversation with the disciples on the road to Emmaus. And on the very eve of the Ascension it would seem that they still had their hopes of an earthly kingdom (Acts i. 6). But from the Day of Pentecost onwards we find something entirely different. We find St. Peter in the very first sermon

that he ever preached referring to the Crucifixion not as something to be apologized for (still less was it something not even to be mentioned), but we find him saying that it was a divinely appointed event. At last they knew the meaning of it all. All the repressed material, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, had been brought to the light of God's own presence, and they understood now what had before been a complete enigma.

What, then, would be the content of their utterances ? This is an exceedingly difficult question to determine, and, in fact, it is hardly possible to do so with certainty since we have not enough material upon which to go. Yet we may hold that our theory hitherto is sound without being obliged to give an entirely satisfactory account of the *content* of the tongues. We may say that we have at any rate traced them to their source, and to that extent made them intelligible. But whatever explanation be adopted it must fulfil three conditions. (1) It must be able to account for the fact that the utterances seemed to some people to be a recounting of the wonderful works of God, whereas to the rest they seemed like the futile babblings of a drunkard. (2) It must be capable of harmonizing with what St. Paul tells us in 1 Cor. xiv. concerning speaking with tongues. (3) It must agree with the account of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the Gentiles (Acts x. 44-46). Professor Pratt has given an interpretation which perhaps many will feel to be as satisfactory a one as we can get under the circumstances. He writes in his book *The Religious Consciousness* (p. 185) as follows: " There had been days of oppressive strain and waiting, and at last the flood gates of emotion were opened and a great revival occurred. Under the influence of this intense emotion some of the individuals started expressing their new-found joy either in some real language which they knew but which was not their own or else in the same sort of meaningless syllables that are used by their imitators to-day. Jerusalem it must be remembered was a decidedly polyglot community, and nearly every individual in this first Christian revival knew a great many words of other languages besides his own—it was impossible to walk the streets without hearing them and learning them. No wonder then that the listeners made credulous by emotional excitement and suggestion should say, ' We hear them speak every one in our own language.' "

Perhaps we cannot go further than this, but it may be worth our while to make an attempt in the light of the earlier part of our theory for which the evidence seems to be strong. We may surmise, then, that the utterances of the " tongues " were fragments of Hebrew texts. We know that our Lord's mind was continually dwelling on the Old Testament in relation to

His approaching death; and there can be little doubt that in what He said about it to His disciples He would have couched His teaching largely in terms of "Moses and the prophets," as He did on the road to Emmaus. And so it was, that shortly after Pentecost we find St. Philip quite familiar with the Messianic interpretation of Isaiah liii. in his interview with the Ethiopian. Was there anything more natural, therefore, than that when those repressed ideas concerning our Lord's death finally broke forth from their prison they should have been uttered in the form of fragments of texts, which our Lord would have planted in their minds in that connection, and which would accordingly have been repressed with them, whether they were understood or not? We are not to suppose that this implies that the Apostles normally spoke Hebrew. The contrary rather, for other parallel cases go to show that at such times the words of an unfamiliar language are more likely to be repressed. If this was the case here, then it is not hard to see how to some people their utterances should have seemed gibberish, while to others they proclaimed "the wonderful works of God." Moreover, as Jews, the hearers might well regard Hebrew as "the tongue in which they were born," in spite of the fact that it was not the language of every-day life.*

Many will perhaps feel that it is more natural to adopt the commonly received view that on this occasion all kinds of different languages were spoken, and not, as we have maintained, one, or at least predominantly one. But would there really be anything very remarkable in a community, which was admittedly cosmopolitan, in all different kinds of languages being heard? Professor Pratt, in the passage which we quoted above, has to say that it was only the state of excitement which prevailed which made it seem remarkable. It may, nevertheless, be thought that, if all the speakers and hearers were Jews there would be nothing more remarkable in Hebrew being heard. In answer to this we may suggest that it was possibly not so much the language which was spoken that caused surprise as the manner in which it was spoken. We know that one of the most characteristic traits of the people of Galilee was their peculiar accent, which apparently consisted in confounding the gutturals. And it may be that the hearers were surprised in that they heard Galileans, or at any rate those who were believed to be Galileans, speaking without the distinctive impediment in their speech. We may suppose that under the stress of an

* It has been pointed out to the writer that, if this theory is correct, the *glossolalia* at Pentecost is exactly paralleled by that of the Camisards who, normally speaking a *patois*, in their "tongues" uttered intelligible exhortations in good French, with which they were acquainted solely through their use of the Huguenot Bible. See Lake's *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 245.

emotional uprush from the subconscious this particular weakness might have been overcome, either because the words as they heard them had not been pronounced in their ears with this distinctive trait, or because the stress of the actual moment of the speaking with " tongues " enabled this particular weakness to be overcome. There is a further point which is worth mentioning in the present connection. The question " How hear we every man in our own tongue ?" is perhaps more naturally taken to refer to one language than to many; if there had been more than one we should have expected " tongues " rather than " tongue."

Let us see how this view of Pentecost agrees with what St. Paul says of the *glossolalia* in 1 Cor. xiv. It must be borne in mind that the phenomenon as he there describes it has occurred all down the ages of the Church's history, and for that matter in non-Christian religions as well. But so far as later examples of speaking with tongues are concerned we must always realize that it is unsafe to argue back from them to Pentecost, as there is the possibility, and indeed more than the possibility, that they are conscious or unconscious imitations of it, and in this case it is more than likely that the less intelligent aspect of the *glossolalia* has been handed on. In other words, men may have got into their minds the fact that on the Day of Pentecost the Apostles broke out into ejaculations, and therefore come to think that, so to say, it was " the thing to do " in a revival; whereas, if they had been wiser they would have paid more heed to what St. Paul had to say on the value of these ejaculations as such.

When we come to the account of the second outpouring of the Holy Spirit—that granted to the Gentiles—we find much to confirm our theory. We find just what we should expect to find. We learn from the twofold account of this event that it was only the Gentiles who spoke with tongues. St. Peter and his six Jewish companions apparently did not do so. And we also note that nothing is said of any vision of wind or flame—which is perfectly natural, according to our theory, if the recipients of the Spirit were Gentiles. What, then, may we suppose to have been the repressed material in this case ? We have here a more certain indication than we have in the case of Pentecost. The great significance of the event for the Gentiles consisted in the fact that the great religious barrier hitherto standing between Jew and Gentile was broken down. It is at the very moment when St. Peter is explicitly stating for the first time in history that this is the case, that we are told that the Holy Ghost fell on them and they began to speak with tongues. Now we know that Cornelius was one φοβούμενος τὸν θέον, that is to say, he belonged to the class of those who, though not actually circumcised proselytes, were regular attendants

at the synagogue. So much seems to be certain in this case, whatever difficulties apply to estimating the exact status of the different kinds of "proselytes." It is certain, therefore, that the barrier between Jew and Gentile would have been painful to him in the extreme. Many and many a time as he sat in the synagogue would the longing that it might be broken down have risen up within him, but he would have been obliged, in the face of obvious facts, to repress all such longings. But on this occasion, as he listens to St. Peter's words, the spring is suddenly released, as it were, and he and his "kinsmen and his near friends" (Acts x. 24), who were doubtless like-minded, could let forth all their longings in complete realization. Nor is the language of the "tongues," perhaps, impossible to determine, though we are not actually given any indication. It would surely be Hebrew as at Pentecost. For in the synagogue, week by week, Cornelius and his friends would have heard the Hebrew Scriptures read.* Much of these would most likely be unintelligible to them, but it may be that they would have understood something of what they heard, and they would be especially quick to fasten on any of the "universalistic" prophecies of the old Covenant. At the time when they heard them they would have in some measure at least to be repressed, but when the repression was released, as it was now, then it would not be surprising if their speaking with tongues should have consisted of fragments of such passages.

This account of these happenings is in complete accord with what we are told of St. Peter's part in them. We know that the beginning of the drama for him lay in a dream, or, as it was in fact, a nightmare, in which his inherited antipathy to the Gentiles was rather thinly disguised under the imagery of the unclean animals. But such was the power of the Holy Spirit within him that he was able to see at once, when the knock at the door came from the friends of Cornelius, that he must obey the summons, "making no distinction." That is to say, the conflict was solved for him by the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit, who was gradually leading him into the fulness of truth. There was no place for repressions and speaking with tongues in his case, for the Spirit of God already ruled his heart. Furthermore, he himself explained before the assembly of the faithful at Jerusalem how when the Holy Spirit fell upon the Gentiles: "Then I remembered the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water: but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost" (Acts xi. 16). It must surely be regarded as strange that St. Peter recalled these words now for the first time rather than at Pentecost. What was the reason for this?

* Unless they were read in Greek only. *Cf.* Schürer, II. ii. 283 *ff.*—Ed.

The most natural answer is that they had for some reason been repressed, in spite of the fact that they had been spoken by our Lord after the Resurrection (Acts i. 5). The question is to discover why they had been repressed. We must remember that St. Peter was the brother of St. Andrew, one of John's disciples, and therefore possibly one of his disciples too. In any case he would have come under his influence. But John's baptism was only for Jews, and therefore the words of our Lord concerning his baptism would naturally, in view of the context in which they were spoken, be regarded as having the same sphere of application. If this is the case, then it is easy to see why any thought that they applied to Gentiles also should have been repressed, and hence why they should have come to mind at this particular moment, when it was realized that their application was world-wide.

We must now pass to a consideration of the first question. How far does this interpretation of the *glossolalia* help us to understand what we mean by the coming of the Holy Spirit? Many attempts have been made to explain the relation of the Spirit to the world before Pentecost and after. All agree that in practice there was a vast difference; but it has never been found easy to state in theoretical form what this relationship is. Thus Swete* attempted to explain the difference before Pentecost and after, by saying that the presence of the Holy Spirit under the old Covenant was analogous to the presence of the Word lightening every man that cometh into the world. But the parallel with the Incarnation is not really helpful, inasmuch as the essence of the latter is that the Word became visible, whereas the Spirit remained invisible after Pentecost as before. Others, with Bishop Gore,† would say that under the old Dispensation men received "gifts" of the Spirit, whereas under the new one they received the Spirit Himself. But it seems impossible thus to distinguish between the Spirit and His "gifts." Moreover, we read of "gifts" of the Spirit in the New Testament as in the Old; and, on the other hand, we are told of St. John the Baptist that "he shall be filled with the Holy Spirit even from his mother's womb" (St. Luke i. 15). Probably not enough has been made of the fact that, after Pentecost, the Holy Spirit dwelt for the first time in a *Community*, whereas hitherto He had been manifested only in "inanimate" nature, and in individuals of one sort or another. This is certainly a vital difference, but we can perhaps go a little further.

It is surely necessary to admit frankly that the Holy Spirit had always, so to speak, been "there." Thus our Lord had

* *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 375.
† *Lux Mundi*, 15th edition, p. 243.

said before the Ascension, according to St. John, "He dwelleth with you and shall be in you" (St. John xiv. 17). Why was He not "in" them? Surely what had been lacking had been the power to appropriate Him. Thus again, our Lord is reported to have said, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he shall guide you into all the truth" (St. John xiv. 12 and 13). That is to say, the main significance of Pentecost (and the same, *mutatis mutandis*, will apply to the outpouring on the Gentiles) is that it consisted in a deepening of the receptive power of man. We read that He could not come until our Lord had ascended. The reason would seem to be that the disciples could never have learnt the true significance of His Person until He was withdrawn from their sight. When they gained a real, one need not say a full, understanding of Him, then they were able to appropriate the Spirit. But the great stumbling block which had to be removed was "the offence of the Cross." When this had been achieved, the last piece of misunderstanding would have disappeared, and so they could receive the fulness of the Spirit. *The true understanding of our Lord, therefore, and the coming of the Spirit were one and the same thing viewed from different sides.* That is to say, the coming of the Holy Spirit was first and foremost an enlightenment. This was precisely what our Lord had promised of the Paraclete. He was to guide them into all the truth, and that truth was pre-eminently the truth concerning Himself. "He shall take of *mine* and shall declare it unto you" (St. John xvi. 14). And if our view of Pentecost be a true one, that is exactly what He did. He revealed the meaning of Calvary.

We have said that the coming of the Holy Spirit was primarily an enlightenment. Are we to maintain that it was only an enlightenment? One thing is certain; we must hold fast to the belief that the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost meant the full endowment of our human nature with all the powers needful for the living of a full and perfect life. If we say, then, that it was only an enlightenment, shall we not be in danger of re-affirming the old Socratic paradox that virtue is knowledge, and of ignoring the phenomenon of what Aristotle called *akrasia?* We are not able indeed to subscribe to that paradox as Plato put it forward, but we have to remember that modern psychology has done much to throw light on the problem since Aristotle tackled it. For this problem is caused by that class of actions in which we do the worse while knowing that it is the worse in the very moment of the act. These actions are now said to be due to "compulsion neuroses" when they occur in a morbid form; but in any form in which they may occur they are known

to be due to the operations of the unconscious. And the whole technique of psycho-analysis goes to show that when once the obscure motives which lie behind such actions in the unconscious are brought to light the compulsion ceases and so the problem is solved.

We see, therefore, that though the phenomenon of *akrasia* is not due to ignorance in the ordinary sense of the term, yet it is due to ignorance of the contents of the unconscious mind. And so, if we enlarge the Socratic paradox so as to include the unconscious as well as the conscious mind, we may hold that it does not misrepresent the facts. In this case, is it not profoundly true that the coming of the Holy Spirit was an enlightenment? For the Holy Spirit shone not only into the conscious minds of the first believers, but also illumined the depths of the unconscious. It was indeed through the latter that He lighted up the former, if we are to take the account of the Day of Pentecost at its face value.

The opinions of psychologists concerning the unconscious are still far too conflicting to build much on any particular theory of it, but it is at least interesting to note that what the New Testament has to tell us of the operations of the Spirit, quite apart from the Pentecostal outpouring, goes to show that His sphere of working is the unconscious; or, to speak more accurately, He influences the conscious through the unconscious, using the latter term in the widest possible manner. We read, for instance, how our Lord told the Apostles that when they were hurried before kings to be tried they were not to take thought how they should speak, since the Holy Spirit would teach them what they should say. And in St. Paul's classical passage about the work of the Spirit in the Epistle to the Romans His operations as there described clearly apply to what we should call the sphere of the unconscious rather than of the conscious.

We must admit, of course, that the fact that the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost took the form of speaking with tongues was due to the presence in the minds of the Apostles of the particular repressions, of which we have spoken. But we need at the same time to hold fast to the belief that in any case His coming, in order to be sufficient for our needs, must have influenced the unconscious as well as the conscious. In this way the whole of that mysterious entity which we call human personality found a harmonizing power sufficient to co-ordinate all the warring elements of the soul. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." So our Lord had spoken. And what is freedom save the absence of conflict in the enlightened soul? Where there is no conflict there is abundant evidence to show that we find *power*. And so our Lord's promise of power

when the Spirit should come really only amounted to the same thing as the promise of enlightenment, for it was an illumination which lit up not only the conscious mind but also the mysterious depths of the unconscious. We are only just beginning to understand, or in any way to appreciate, the amazing power of the Holy Spirit to solve the various and manifold conflicts which tear the soul of man, and it is no part of this paper, which is concerned primarily with Pentecost, to go into the question. But our study of the coming of the Holy Spirit has at least made two things clear in this connection. When the Holy Spirit is given to the faithful He rules the whole personality, conscious and unconscious, unless He is driven out by wilful disobedience. And to those who yield themselves to be led by the Spirit of God, there will no longer arise either repression or suppression, for all the conflicts in the heart of man will be sublimated by Him who came to reveal Him who is Representative Man, who in His humiliation and glorification is able to satisfy all the needs of the human heart.

LINDSAY DEWAR.

THE ENGLISH CANON OF 1549 AND ITS INVOCATION

WHEN the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. appeared in 1549, it was doubtless received with very different feelings by different classes of persons. Some (and among these the more unlearned) would be struck by the differences between the services in it and those to which they had been accustomed. The English language, unfamiliar to them in the offices of the Church; the saying of the Canon, etc., by the priest aloud instead of secretly; the absence of prayers to the Saints; the simplification of ceremonial—these and other changes would make them regard the new service-book as embodying a complete revolution in public worship.

But there were others (including some of the more learned) who would come to a very different conclusion. The changes which made such an impression on the vulgar would not strike them; for, after all, these affected only the outer shell and not the kernel of the services. That remained much the same as it had done before. As an example, let us take one formula only—but that the most important—the Canon of the Mass. The doctrine taught in the new Canon was practically the same as in the old. The four mentions of Christ's Body or Blood were all retained in nearly the same words. The benefits obtained

by worthy communicants were expressed in even stronger language. The Eucharist was still regarded as an offering, and prayer was still made for its acceptance; though the abnormal prominence of this last side of Eucharistic doctrine displayed by the old Canon (abnormal, as may be seen by comparison with the anaphoræ of the Greek liturgies, *e.g.*, St. Basil) had disappeared.

The severest critics of the Roman Canon can hardly help admitting that it contains some very beautiful passages, perhaps the most beautiful being the Memento of the dead. On the other hand, its staunchest upholder must acknowledge, if he will confess the truth, that it is a rambling, ill-constructed formula, altogether wanting in that logical sequence of thought which is so impressive in most of the Greek anaphoræ. As early as its second word we come across a serious difficulty. "Te *igitur*"—"Thee, *therefore*, O most merciful Father, we ask and pray." The *Sanctus* has immediately preceded, and hence the "therefore" ought to refer to something in that grand hymn. But nothing in the *Sanctus* seems to have the slightest connection with the petition that follows. Again, there are, in different parts of the Canon, two prayers for the blessing of the elements and three for the acceptance of the Eucharistic offerings—also two lists of saints, twenty-five names being given in one and fifteen in the other. Further, the intercessions for the living and the dead are separated, the former coming before consecration and the latter after. In fact, eminent Roman Catholic scholars are agreed that the Canon shows "marks of a complete re-arrangement, or even dislocation and shortening, of the different clauses; in which process" it "has suffered very severely" (Legg, *Essays Liturgical and Historical*, p. 28). An examination of Dom Cabrol's article *Canon Romain*, in his *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie* (vol. ii., coll. 1847 *seq.*), will establish beyond doubt the truth of Dr. Legg's statement. Such was the document which lay before the compilers of the first Prayer Book. Let us see how they treated it.

1. It is quite clear that they had no superstitious reverence for its wording. Such reverence had, no doubt, existed in the West at an earlier period, when men in general knew of no other Prayer of Consecration in existence. But by 1549 the Greek Liturgies had appeared in print, and all scholars knew that Prayers of Consecration might be just as good as the Roman Canon and yet be worded very differently.

2. All the main points of the old Canon are represented in the new, though some perhaps not quite so fully, and very little that is really novel has been introduced. The prayers for the Church, the Bishop, the King (it must be remembered that,

in the Sarum form of the Canon—the one with which the compilers were acquainted—the King had always been prayed for by name and that the name of the Pope had been deleted some years previously), the congregation and the departed, the blessing of the elements, the recital of the Institution, the Anamnesis, the petition for the acceptance of the Eucharistic offering, the prayer for the communicants, the concluding doxology, the sign of the cross and the manual acts are all there; and the Canon is still immediately followed by the Lord's Prayer. Only two things of any importance seem to be entirely unrepresented —the clause which speaks of the merits and prayers of the Saints, and that which mentions the sacrifices of the Patriarchs.

3. An attempt has been made to remedy the confused order of the old Canon. There is now one commemoration of the Saints instead of two; one of the two prayers for the blessing of the elements has been omitted and one (the more important) retained; the three prayers for the acceptance of the offering are compressed into one (though there occurs, later on, another similar petition which appears to refer to the offering of ourselves); and the intercessions for the living and the dead, instead of being separated by the consecration, are now united, and form, together with the commemoration of the Saints, one orderly prayer for " the whole state of Christ's Church."

4. An attempt has been made to give the new Canon a logical sequence. First comes the prayer for the Church; then the blessing of the elements, the recital of the Institution and the Anamnesis; these are followed by petition for the acceptance of the offering, for the congregation and for the communicants; and finally there is the doxology. It is a pity something more was not done, and the Canon turned into a thanksgiving, as all ancient Prayers of Consecration are with the exception of the Roman.

5. Ceremonies have been simplified. Needless ones, such as kissing the altar and beating the breast, have been omitted. Elevation after the words of Institution—a modernism, not three hundred and fifty years old in 1549—has been forbidden. But the really important ceremonies—the sign of the cross and the manual acts—have been retained, though with simplifications, the former being prescribed only twice instead of some twenty-eight times.

Thus the Canon of 1549 is, probably from a liturgical point of view and certainly from a logical point of view, a great improvement on its predecessor.

Now let us look at those parts of it which are really new. They are five in number: (1) the prayer for the King's Council and all in authority; (2) the petition for those in trouble, sorrow,

need or sickness; (3) the noble description of Christ's one oblation made on the cross; (4) the invocation of the Holy Ghost in the blessing of the elements; (5) the offering of ourselves, our souls and bodies. Most people will, we think, consider the first three and the last of these as valuable gains. But the fourth deserves particular attention, especially at the present time, when all questions concerning the Prayer of Consecration are being so thoroughly examined and so warmly debated.

We must begin by quoting the Invocation in full: "With thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ."

What was the origin of the new portion of this—the first half? There is no difficulty in answering that question; it was derived from the Greek liturgies. In proof of this, I may cite from a book, a main object of which is to show the Protestant character of the Prayer Book of 1549, the following admission, so damaging to that object: "There can be no reasonable doubt that the passage was suggested by the invocation of the Holy Ghost found after the words of institution in the Greek Liturgies" (*Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, Gasquet and E. Bishop, p. 204). And the writers go on to surmise, doubtless correctly, that, as the only Greek Liturgy in which the particular phrase "bless and sanctify these gifts" is used in this connection is that of St. Basil, it was this Liturgy which suggested the first half of our Invocation. The second half—"that they may be unto us," etc.—is almost a word for word translation of the corresponding prayer in the Latin Canon.

Thus the Invocation in question contains a remarkable combination of Greek and Latin formulæ, and it becomes a matter of interest to inquire into the reasons which led to its adoption. Two reasons may be named, both of which are probably true.

1. The compilers may have thought it possible that the Church of England might become the organ of reconciliation between East and West. So far as public worship is concerned, the chief obstacle to reconciliation was, and still is, the difference of the methods in which the two consecrate the Eucharist. And so the Invocation in the new Canon may have been worded with a view to its being acceptable to both.

2. They may have been influenced by doctrinal considerations. The consecration of the elements, though in a certain sense it may be attributed to the priest who celebrates, is not really his work at all. It is the work of God who, in answer to prayer, sends the Agent of sanctification, the Holy Ghost, upon them.

This doctrine is both primitive and catholic. It is *primitive*, for it can be traced back to the third century, before which period all statements about consecration are, as Dr. Brightman says (THEOLOGY, July, 1924, p. 36), "quite general and indefinite or at least of doubtful interpretation." But in the third century we find an Eastern writer, the author of the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, saying definitely (vi. 21, § 2) that the Eucharist "is sanctified by the Holy Ghost," and a contemporary Western writer, Cyprian (*Ep.* lxv., 4), expressing the same truth in a negative form: "the offering (Eucharist) cannot there be sanctified where the Holy Ghost is not." No other doctrine of Eucharistic consecration can claim so high an antiquity.

But the doctrine in question is *catholic* as well as primitive. It has admittedly been the teaching of Eastern theologians in general from the fourth century downwards. And, though it has not been taught so often or so emphatically by theologians in the West, still it finds expression from time to time in their writings. To prove this, we need only quote three well-known Western theologians of different periods: St. Augustine, St. Isidore of Seville, and St. Thomas Aquinas. St. Augustine (*On the Trinity*, iii. 4, § 10) tells us that the Eucharist "is not sanctified to be so great a Sacrament except by the invisible working of the Spirit of God." And, if there be any doubt (which there ought not to be) as to what he meant by the "Spirit of God," it will be set at rest by another passage in his works (*Questions on the Heptateuch*, iii., qu. 84): "Moses (sanctifies) by visible sacraments through his ministry; but the Lord by invisible grace through the Holy Ghost, in which is the whole fruit even of visible sacraments. For without this sanctification of invisible grace what do visible sacraments profit?" St. Isidore of Seville (seventh century) says of the Prayer of Consecration (the sixth in the Spanish Liturgy according to his reckoning): "The sixth follows, the consecration (*conformatio*) of the Sacrament, that the offering which is offered to God, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, may be consecrated (*conformetur*) to the body and blood of Christ" (*De Eccles. Off.*, i. 15). And lastly, St. Thomas Aquinas (*Summa*, III. lxxviii. 4 ad 1) quotes a Greek Father, St. John of Damascus, to the effect that "the change of bread into the body of Christ takes place by the sole power of the Holy Ghost." And he finds no fault with the doctrine thus expressed, but adds that "the instrumental power (*virtus instrumentalis*) which is in the form of this Sacrament is not" hereby "excluded."

The modern Roman Church too has no objection to this doctrine. She even teaches it in her Missal, as the following extract from the Friday division of the long "Prayer of St.

Ambrose" (to be said as part of the priest's preparation before celebrating) will show. "May there also descend, O Lord, the invisible and incomprehensible Majesty of thy Holy Spirit, as of old it descended on the sacrifices of the Patriarchs, to make our offerings thy Body and Blood, and also to teach me, an unworthy priest, to handle so great a mystery," etc.

But what about our best English Divines? The doctrine in question was by no means unknown to them. Let me cite three examples. (1) Jeremy Taylor, in his *Collection of Offices* (intended for use when the Prayer Book was forbidden during the Commonweath), inserts a direct Invocation of the Holy Ghost on the Eucharistic elements (*Works*, ed. Eden, viii., p. 624). So does Bishop Wilson in his *Sacra Privata* (*Works*, v., p. 74—*Libr. Ang.-Cath. Theol.*). And Thorndike (*Works*, v., p. 173—*Libr. Ang.-Cath. Theol.*) says of the consecration that it "is executed, and always hath been executed, by the act of the Church, upon God's word of institution, praying that the Holy Ghost, coming down upon the present elements, may make them the body and blood of Christ."

Two of the most important questions now before the National Assembly of the Church of England in its revision of the Prayer Book have to do with the Prayer of Consecration. One is, whether an alternative form of that Prayer is to be sanctioned; and the second refers to the contents of that alternative form. In all probability the former question will be settled in the affirmative. And, if so, I would plead very strongly for the insertion in the alternative Prayer of an Invocation of the Holy Ghost, if not in its more usual place—after the recital of the Institution—at any rate in the position which it occupies in the Canon of 1549. And this for the following reasons:

1. We have seen that the doctrine which it expresses is both catholic, in the fullest sense of the word, and also primitive. Hence such an Invocation would make our rite more truly primitive, and, at the same time, more truly catholic.

2. It would link us with both East and West, and might even be a step towards the reunion of Christendom.

3. The Holy Ghost has a double function in the Eucharist. It is His office to prepare the communicants for the reception of the elements; and it is also His office to prepare the elements for the communicants. We recognize the former of these two functions in the Collect for Purity; but our present rite contains no recognition of the latter. And the Invocation of 1549 would remedy this omission.

4. The Prayer Book is at present open to the serious accusation of ignoring to a large extent the work of the Holy Ghost—a defect which it unfortunately shares with most Western service-

books. The most glaring instance of this is contained in the Prayer of Consecration. And the insertion of an Invocation of the Holy Ghost in that Prayer is the one and only method of successfully repelling the above-named accusation.

If the question be asked, what special form of Invocation should be adopted, many suitable ones might be suggested; but none could be found more suitable than that of 1549. This Invocation possesses many features which ought to recommend it to our favourable consideration.

1. It comes to us on good credentials. It forms part of what is probably the most satisfactory Canon ever used in the Church of England.

2. Its wording is a happy blending of what is best in both Eastern and Western Liturgies.

3. Its doctrine is thoroughly catholic and yet comprehensive. It can be used with good conscience by those who regard the Invocation as the main element of Consecration and also by those who look rather to the words of Institution.

4. It is probably the most scriptural Invocation that has ever been composed, as the following analysis may show:

"Bless" (used of Eucharistic Consecration) (Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22; 1 Cor. x. 16).
"Sanctify" (in connection with grace over food in general, and therefore *a fortiori* applicable to the Eucharist) (1 Tim. iv. 5).
"Sanctify by the Holy Spirit" (Rom. xv. 16).
"Sanctify through the word of God" (1 Tim. iv. 5).
"Creature" (applied to articles of food) (1 Tim. iv. 4).
"Body and Blood of Christ" (of the Eucharistic elements) (Matt. xxvi. 26, 28; Mark xiv. 22, 24; Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. x. 16, xi. 24, 27).
"Unto us"="which is *for you*" (1 Cor. xi. 24).

In fact, it would not be saying too much if we described the Invocation of 1549 as a beautifully constructed mosaic, made of phrases of Scripture.

J. W. Tyrer.

IMPRESSIONS OF THE FIRST ANGLICAN PILGRIMAGE TO JERUSALEM

The first Anglican Pilgrimage to Jerusalem had three purposes:

1. To help its members to deepen their own devotion by praying at the Holy Places.

2. To strengthen the hands of our Bishop in Jerusalem and his flock.

3. To promote the reunion of Christendom.

The first object was obvious from the beginning: the second was impressed on us before we started by the request of the Bishop in Jerusalem: the third developed before our eyes as soon as we landed in the East.

The Holy Places have been much maligned by travellers. It is true that by themselves, and apart from their past history, they are not the most impressive spots on the globe. We have no right to expect them to be so. Christians do not go to Palestine to see magnificent scenery, or great architectural masterpieces. They go with the intention of trying to realize more deeply the great events to which we owe our salvation, at the places where they happened, or at any rate as near those places as possible.

I expected to find the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (or, as the Greeks call it, the Church of the Resurrection), tawdry and disappointing. I did not find anything of the sort. There is a wonderful atmosphere about it, as one would expect at the place where so many thousands have prayed. As we went, day after day, to pray on the site of Calvary, the great church seemed to grow upon us: the air was thick with the prayers of all who have knelt there since the days of St. Helena. It does not rank with the great cathedrals of Christendom. No church built in 1810 could! But enough is left of the Crusaders' building to save it from anything like ugliness. The innumerable lamps of all sizes and shapes do not seem out of place. After all, we are in the East: we cannot expect an Eastern church to conform to Anglican or Latin conventions, and personally I am thankful that it does not. Nor did the arrangement by which it is shared by different communions seem to me anything but entirely right. On Sunday morning it was possible to hear the Greek, Latin, Armenian, Syrian Jacobite, Coptic, and Anglican liturgies all being offered under the same roof. (We were allowed by the courtesy of the Orthodox Greek Patriarch to use the Chapel of Abraham: without which we should have been in serious difficulty, for St. George's Cathedral was too far for most of us to walk out to in the early morning.) The different services did not disturb or interfere with one another: every Christian communion that has a liturgy or a hierarchy at all (except the Assyrians and the Old Catholics) was represented there: and the offering of the same sacrifice in all those different rites and languages around the Empty Tomb seemed like a foreshadowing of the reunited Church, in which every rite and every nation will have its own place and its own liberty.

What is true of the Holy Sepulchre is true, according to their measure, of the other Holy Places. In order to appreciate them and to receive the full value of the pilgrimage, we must go with a mind and heart that can sympathize with historical Christianity.

Disappointment with the Holy Land is partly due to the conception of Christianity, so common amongst us in the past, which takes no interest in anything that has happened since the latest books of the New Testament were written. The traditional sites of the Last Supper and of the Ascension are unhappily in Moslem hands: but at the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem (which is the same building that St. Jerome knew), the Virgin's Fountain at Nazareth, Jacob's Well at Sychar, and the confused mass of stones which marks the site of Capernaum, one feels that one is not only standing where our Saviour stood, but that one is also carrying on the tradition of the innumerable Christians in every age who have come from every part of Christendom to pray at the Holy Places.

But the pilgrimage did not only inspire our personal devotion, it also opened our eyes to many things which before we had only dimly understood. Jerusalem is the most holy place on earth for Christians and Jews: for Moslems it ranks next to Mecca and Medina. Whatever happens at Jerusalem is sure to have its effect wherever those three religions are believed and taught. It is of the utmost importance that the form in which the Christian religion is presented at Jerusalem should be such as to attract and to impress those who are without. Unfortunately, the rule of the Turks, with its results in constant disputes between the different Christian communities, and the efforts of Western Powers to gain political advantage from these disputes, caused our religion to appear, too often, in the worst light instead of the best: and the effect of centuries of subjection on the habits of thought of Eastern Christians cannot be removed quickly. But the English Church has in the Holy Land an unique opportunity of serving Christendom. Through circumstances for which we need not claim any credit, we alone among the great historic Churches have no immemorial rights of property at the Holy Sepulchre. We are in the Holy Land, not to claim anything for ourselves, not to proselytize from other churches, but simply to supply the needs of our own people, to help the other communions in any way that may be possible, and to do the missionary work among Jews and Moslems that the Eastern Churches have not been able, by reason of their subjection to the Turks, to do themselves. The principal work of the English Church in Jerusalem, besides ministering to its own members, is educational and eirenic. At St. George's College the best secondary education in Palestine is given to Christians of different communions, and also to Moslems, who are obliged, as a condition of attending the school, to receive Christian teaching. It is hoped that boys of the Greek, Armenian, and other communions, who have lived and worked and played together at St. George's, will learn that loyalty to the Church of one's own nation ought to

involve a deeper loyalty to the one Church which transcends all nations: and that the young Moslems there (among whom are to be found the sons of some of the sheikhs of the Dome of the Rock) will perceive that the representation of Christianity given by Moslem teachers has been in many respects very far removed from the truth.

But the English Church in Jerusalem, as elsewhere, suffers from the mistakes of former generations. From 1841 to 1881 the Anglican Bishops in Jerusalem were appointed by the British and Prussian Governments alternately, and were in charge of Lutheran as well as Anglican congregations. Bishop Gobat, originally a Swiss Protestant, who was Bishop from 1843 to 1879, adopted a policy of proselytizing from other Churches, in the interest of a narrow Protestantism. The descendants of the Anglican congregations formed in those days cling to the religion which their grandfathers were taught with all the tenacity of the East. The Bishop has no real control over them, nor responsibility for what they do: and the difficulty of presenting English Catholicism adequately in the Holy Land is increased by the fact that many native members of the Anglican Communion have no sympathy with the English Catholic tradition, but are Anglican, so to speak, by accident.

And yet there is no country where it is more important to present English Catholicism in its best and most attractive form. The East is changing rapidly. Islam is entering a stage comparable to the Renaissance in European Christianity, of which the abolition of the Caliphate and the prohibition of polygamy in Turkey are startling signs. Even the Jews are beginning to show a more tolerant attitude towards Christianity. It is high time that the Eastern Churches prepared themselves to face the problems of the modern world. Already the difficulties which hindered the ordination of Arabic-speaking priests for the Orthodox Church in Palestine are beginning to be overcome with the help of the English Church. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem already recognizes Anglican Orders as having equal value with those of Rome: and though the Patriarch of Antioch and his synod have not yet formally considered the question, they were quite as kind to us as the Orthodox of Palestine. The Patriarch of Jerusalem and most of his clergy are Greeks, but the Patriarch of Antioch is a native Syrian. Since the thirteenth century the Orthodox Patriarchs of Antioch have resided at Damascus: where His Beatitude the Patriarch Gregory received us with the utmost cordiality, coming to the door to meet us (which is a special mark of honour), and showing us round his cathedral himself. We were allowed to use a church in the Patriarchate while we were in Damascus, and should have been given the same privilege at Baalbek, where we spent a Sunday:

but the church had been desecrated by the Turks during the war, and had never been restored. So we had our Eucharist in the house of one of the leading Orthodox laymen, and most of the Orthodox community were present at it. Nothing could exceed the kindness of both clergy and laity in both Patriarchates: at Nazareth we were even invited to wear the vestments belonging to the Church, and there, as at Damascus and Baalbek, we had the use of the Orthodox candles and icons.

We could not escape, however, from the shadow of two great tragedies: the tragedy of Russia and the tragedy of Armenia. A visit to the Russian convent on the Mount of Olives, where 160 nuns are living on an allowance of ten shillings a month each, eking it out by going into domestic service, gave us a hint of the gaping wound which the Russian Revolution has made in the body of Christendom. The Armenian Convent at Jerusalem takes charge of a few of the 40,000 Armenian orphans scattered over the Near East, many of whom will never know who their parents were. I met an Armenian boy who had been left for dead beneath the bodies of his parents, murdered before his eyes. Of all the Easterns whom we met, the Armenians were the most European in appearance and the most modern in their ways. It was pathetic to hear the priest who showed us round their cathedral at Jerusalem say: "A few years ago we had hundreds of convents: to-day this is the only one left. You see, we trusted the Christian nations of Europe!"

What the English Church is doing in Palestine is little indeed when viewed against the background of these enormous catastrophes: and yet the seed which is now being sown may be destined to bring forth much fruit. For many centuries the Eastern Churches have lived in separation, till they have lost the very ideal of visible unity. Their Moslem rulers have taken good care to promote their divisions. But now it is easy for them to meet one another, at any rate socially. Three times during the Pilgrimage, once at Alexandria and twice at Jerusalem, we met representatives of all the Eastern Churches together. The Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem, who is a learned anthropologist, and the leaders of the Jacobites, Copts, and Abyssinians were as friendly as the Orthodox. The cordiality with which we were everywhere received is entirely due to the work of the present Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem, and his predecessor, Bishop Blyth. If only the English Church will give enough support to Dr. MacInnes and his staff at that strategic point where all Christians meet and therefore where all divisions appear to be sharpest, it may yet come to pass that the reunion of Christendom, like the original preaching of the Gospel, will begin at Jerusalem.

C. B. Moss.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Miss M. L. Kirkpatrick, Newspaper Secretary of S.P.G. (15, Tufton Street, S.W. 1), writes that she has five Missionaries asking for Theology, and would be glad to give names and addresses to any of our readers who would be willing to post on their copies.

May we again endorse this appeal, which has had excellent results on earlier occasions ?

We have had several enquiries as to where the Winchester Diocesan Syllabus of Religious Instructions, to which we referred in September, can be purchased. It can be had of Messrs. Warren and Son, High Street, Winchester, price 1s. 2d., post free.

We published last May an appeal for support of the fund which Canon Robinson is raising for the building of a new school at Hursley, Keble's home for many years. We beg to acknowledge to-day the receipt of a cheque for £10 from Mr. A. H. Lewes, Fernside, Bowral, New South Wales, Australia, " which I count it a privilege (he says) to be able to give for the sake of John Keble." In addition to this, we have been glad to forward one or two smaller donations. But about £2,000 is still needed. Who will help ?

Last year a short mystical work by Ramón Lull, one of the best-known Spanish Franciscans, was published by the S.P.C.K. The translator, Professor Allison Peers, of the University of Liverpool, is anxious to undertake the translation of some of the longer works of Lull if sufficient support can be obtained. He would be glad to hear from any admirers of St. Francis and his followers, or others who have read the *Book of the Lover and the Beloved*, and would wish to be informed of any further publications that are undertaken.

Dr. Linderholm, a Swedish Professor, recently compiled a prayer book for use in public worship, This has now been translated into German, with an Introduction by Rudolf Otto, author of *The Idea of the Holy*. It is interesting to learn from a review in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, July 26, 1914, that it makes considerable use of the *Grey Book*.

RESERVATION OF THE CHALICE

I

Appendix to my Letter of February 26, 1924, on Communion under One Kind.

In your first letter to me you said that you believe you are " right in saying that there is no precedent for Reserving the Chalice."

In what follows I propose to keep strictly to that point; and in discussing the matter of reservation, I intend to limit myself to the public

official reservation of the Blessed Sacrament by the Clergy of the Church, as well as to their official ministration of the reserved Sacrament to the sick at their own homes, and also to persons who might wish to communicate in church on Good Friday, when there is no public celebration of the Holy Eucharist.

Such official reservation and administration of the reserved Sacrament is the only kind of reservation and administration which is ever practised now. Of course, in the days of persecution, and also among the hermits in the deserts after the persecution had ceased, the faithful were often allowed to carry the Blessed Sacrament to their own homes and to reserve It there, and to administer It to themselves. But those practices have now come to an end, and it would needlessly complicate matters, if I were to take them into account.

I. The earliest Father among those whose writings have come down to us, who gives an account of the way in which the Holy Eucharist was celebrated, is St. Justin Martyr. In his First Apology (or Defence of Christianity) addressed to the heathen Emperor Antoninus Pius, about the year 148, St. Justin gives two accounts of the Eucharistic Celebration. In Chapter 65 he describes a baptismal Mass, that is to say, a Mass immediately following the baptism (including, of course, the confirmation) of one or more catechumens; and in Chapter 67 he describes the ordinary weekly Mass, which was celebrated at the weekly Christian assembly for worship on Sunday. In both accounts he mentions the Great Thanksgiving which corresponds with our Consecration-Prayer, and the loud Amen with which the congregation expressed their assent to what the Celebrant had uttered. After which he says, " Those, who among us are called Deacons, give to each of those who are present to partake of the Eucharistized (*i.e.*, Consecrated) Bread and Wine and Water; and to those who are absent the Consecrated Things are sent by the hands of the Deacons."

It is to be noted that St. Justin is not describing to the Emperor what happened on some isolated occasion, but is setting forth the customary practice of the Church. That custom included the reservation of what remained of the consecrated Elements under both kinds, and the sending of them under both kinds by the Deacons to such members of the Church as had been unable to be present. In what way the Deacons conveyed the Holy Things to the absent we do not know. It is not likely that they carried the Sacrament of the Precious Blood in an open Chalice through the streets of a heathen city like Rome. But there would be no difficulty in devising means for Its safe conveyance.

II. Before I go on to quote the next patristic passage bearing on the matter under discussion, it will be well, I think, to call attention to a statement made by the late deeply lamented Father Freestone, C.R., in his extremely painstaking and learned book entitled *The Sacrament Reserved* (Mowbray and Co., Ltd., 1917). It occurs in chapter viii., which deals with " Official Reservation during the First Six Centuries." Speaking of that peculiarly important period of time, he says, on p. 106: " It must be acknowledged that evidence of a satisfactory kind for the official Reservation of the Sacrament is extraordinarily scanty." There can be no doubt that that statement is strictly true. But it must not lead us to doubt that the Church devised means, even during the worst times of persecution, for providing her sick and dying members, whether in their own homes or in the prisons of the heathen Empire, with the Body and

Blood of our Lord. We have already seen that during the second century the Deacons carried the Reserved Sacrament, apparently after every Mass, to the absent members of the Church. During the third century and the first twenty years of the fourth century the persecutions became much more severe, and it was during that period that the custom of allowing lay Christians to take home with them the Blessed Sacrament and reserving It for private consumption, arose. After the Empire became nominally Christian, the evidence, though still scanty, becomes somewhat more plentiful; and with this remark I pass on to the next piece of evidence.

St. Jerome, writing in the year 411 to a young monk named Rusticus, who later on in life became Bishop of Narbonne, urges him to follow the example of St. Exuperius, the Bishop of Toulouse, in his love of holy poverty. Exuperius had, some years previously, sent large sums of money to be distributed among the monks of Palestine, Egypt, and Libya. At a later date his diocese had been ravaged by the barbarian hordes of Vandals, Alani, and Suevi; and the learned Bollandists have made it seem probable that, to meet the needs of the poor in his diocese, he had felt compelled to part with the sacred vessels belonging to his church (cf. *Acta SS.*, tom. vii., Septembr., p. 629). Anyhow, St. Jerome says to Rusticus (Migne's *Patrol. Lat.*, xxii., 1085; St. Hieronym., *Ep.* cxxv., n. 20), speaking of St. Exuperius: "None is richer than he, who carries the Body of our Lord in a wicker basket, and the Lord's Blood in a glass vessel."

The Saint of Toulouse evidently reserved the Blessed Sacrament under both kinds, in order to communicate the sick and dying in the way appointed by our Saviour. No astonishment is expressed by St. Jerome at the Reservation *sub utraque*, no doubt because it was the general custom to do so in that age. It is the example of austere poverty which rouses his admiration.

III. Continuing for the present our search for evidence among the Latin writers, I come to St. Cæsarius, who was Bishop of Arles in Southern Gaul from 502 to 542, and had been appointed by the Pope to be his Vicar for the whole of Gaul. Many of his sermons have been wrongly attributed to St. Augustine, and are now most easily to be found in the Appendix to St. Augustine's sermons. In one of these sermons (*Serm.* cclxv., n. 3, in *Append. Serm.*, St. August.: *P.L.*, xxxix., 223) St. Cæsarius says: "As often as any sickness comes upon anyone, let him who is sick receive the Body and Blood of Christ; and then let him anoint his own body, so that that which is written may be fulfilled in him: 'Is any sick among you, let him call for the Presbyters of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the Name of the Lord,' etc. You see, brethren, that he, who is in sickness, should run to the Church, and he will merit to receive health of body and also the pardon of his sins." St. Cæsarius is here speaking of what Christian people ought to do when "*any* sickness" comes upon them. The expression "*any* sickness" may possibly include cases of light sickness; but the Saint probably had mainly in view serious illnesses; and people who are seriously ill cannot physically run to the house of God. The expression, "run to the Church," means obviously "have recourse to Holy Church," as represented by her Presbyters, and "call for" them to bring with them the Body and Blood of our Lord and the *Oleum Infirmorum*. St. Cæsarius repeats this admonition to sick people, using slightly different expressions, in another of his sermons (*Serm.* cclxxix., n. 5, in *Append. Serm.*, St. August.: *P.L.*, xxxix., 2273).

Calls may come to Priests from sick people at any hour of the day or night, and therefore normally the Body and Blood of the Lord must have been reserved *sub utraque*, if the sick were to be communicated in the way the Saint describes.

IV. Passing over a considerable portion of a century, I will next appeal to the high authority of Pope St. Gregory the Great. In the second Book of his Dialogues (cap. 37: *P.L.*, lxvi., 202) he is describing the death of the Patriarch of Western Monasticism, St. Benedict of Nursia, who died at Monte Cassino; and he says: "He fortified his departure by receiving the Body and Blood of the Lord . . . and breathed out his last breath, uttering words of prayer." On the last day of his life, just before his death, he caused himself to be carried by his disciples into an oratory in the monastery, and there he received his *Viaticum;* and immediately afterwards, supported by the hands of his monks, he died, standing, with his hands lifted up to heaven. St. Gregory does not in any way suggest that Mass was being said. It is clear that St. Benedict was communicated in his last moments from the Reserved Sacrament. But the Sacrament was reserved under both kinds.

V. The same St. Gregory (*Dial.*, lib. iv., cap. 35: *P.L.*, lxxvii., 377), narrating the departure out of this world of a holy monk named John, who lived in a monastery on the outskirts of Spoleto, where his brother was Abbot, says, that "when he reached the hour of his death, he received the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord."

VI. Again, the same St. Gregory (*Dial.*, lib. iii., cap. 36: *P.L.*, lxxvii. 304) tells us how when, before he became Pope, he was acting as his predecessor's nuncio at Constantinople, the Abbot of his Roman monastery, Maximian by name, came with some of his monks from Rome to visit him. On their return voyage a terrific storm burst upon them, and the masts, the sails, and the rudders were all of them rendered useless. Great fissures opened in the sides of the ship, which became filled with water. Those on board were not merely conscious of being in danger of death; they found themselves face to face with it. Under these circumstances "they gave each other the kiss of peace, and partook of the Body and Blood of the Redeemer, committing themselves to God." Thereupon God intervened in their behalf. For eight days the ship remained afloat, and finally drifted into the harbour of Crotona, where they all landed; and then, inside the harbour, the ship sank. It is admitted by all, who have written on the matter, that it would not have been possible to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice under such conditions, and it is therefore clear that the monks had with them on board the Reserved Sacrament under both kinds. There is nothing to surprise one in such Reservation. All the evidence that we have concerning the custom of that age would lead one to expect that, if the Abbot decided to bring a supply of the Blessed Sacrament with him, he would bring It under both kinds. In fact, how else could a Christian Priest act, if he wished to fulfil the commands of our Lord?

VII. So far, the witnesses that I have cited have been describing the usage of the Western part of the Church; for even St. Justin, though born of heathen parents in Palestine, was martyred in Rome, and was probably living in Rome when he wrote his two Apologies. It is time, therefore, to say something about the Church in the East. Let us therefore consider the practice of the Church in the civil and ecclesiastical metropolis of the East, Constantinople, in the year 404, just two centuries earlier than the death of Pope St. Gregory the Great.

The archiepiscopal throne in the Constantinopolitan Church was at that time fulfilled by its most illustrious occupant, St. John Chrysostom. He had incurred the enmity of the Empress Eudoxia, the wife of the feeble Emperor Arcadius. The imperial power was practically wielded by the Empress; and so it came to pass that towards sunset on the evening preceding the holy night of Easter Eve, the most sacred night of the whole year, when the catechumens prepared during Lent were to be baptized and confirmed, and at the solemn Paschal Mass which immediately followed were to receive their first Communion, a detachment of soldiers burst into the great church of St. Sophia, the principal among all the churches of the city. Such an unusual proceeding taking place on a night of surpassing solemnity, cannot have been carried out without the connivance, if not by the direct order, of the Empress.

St. Chrysostom had been prohibited by an imperial command from ministering in the church, but was still allowed to occupy the episcopal residence. He therefore was not in the church when the soldiers burst in. But he was, of course, immediately informed of what had taken place; and, either during that night or on the following day, he indited a letter recounting the whole series of atrocious acts which had culminated in the horrible murders and sacrileges that had interrupted the solemnities of the sacred Paschal night. Of this letter three copies were made and addressed to the three Metropolitan Bishops of Italy, namely, Innocent of Rome, Venerius of Milan, and Chromatius of Aquileia. These Bishops lived in the Western Empire under the rule of the Emperor Honorius, and therefore outside the jurisdiction of Arcadius. In this letter St. Chrysostom, after mentioning the brutal murders committed in the church by the soldiers, the baptismal tanks filled with blood, the hallowed waters crimsoned with gore, and other horrors which need not be enumerated, goes on to say: "Moreover, the dreadful business did not stop there, for the soldiers, some of whom, as I have ascertained, were not initiated (*i.e.*, were still unbaptized), pressed on to the place where the Holy Things were reserved, and saw all that there was within [the aumbries], and the most holy Blood of Christ was poured out upon their garments." This letter is preserved in Palladius's *Historic Dialogue:* St. Chrys., *Opp.*, edit. Ben., Venet., 1741, tom. xiii., p. 8. Palladius was Bishop of Helenopolis, and was present in Constantinople when the trouble took place.

Nothing can be plainer than the fact that at Constantinople, in the time of St. Chrysostom's pontificate, the Blessed Sacrament was reserved under both kinds. Father Freestone admits that on that particular Easter Eve the Blessed Sacrament was undoubtedly reserved *sub utraque.* But he says (*The Sacrament Reserved*, p. 109): "Almost certainly the Sacrament had been consecrated two days before (on Maundy Thursday), to serve for the Communion of the faithful on Good Friday and for that of the newly baptized on Easter Even." He makes no attempt to give any proof of the truth of this suggestion. He appends no marginal note containing references to either ancient or modern writers favouring it. And I can only say for myself that, with the deepest respect for Father Freestone, I regard the suggestion as absolutely incredible. For the Baptismal Mass on the Paschal night was celebrated for the express purpose of providing Communion for the newly baptized, as well as for all the faithful who would wish to make their Easter Communion. On that particular Easter Eve there were nearly 3,000 catechumens to be baptized, and there would be thousands more in Constantinople who would wish to

make their Easter Communion in the principal church of the city. Under such conditions as those which we are considering, the services of the Paschal night used often to begin at 3 p.m., and would not be concluded till nearly dawn on Easter morning.

Out of respect for Fr. Freestone, I thought it well to consult Dr. Brightman as to the possibility of there being any solidity in Fr. Freestone's hypothesis. But I found that Dr. Brightman felt as strongly as I did myself that that hypothesis is absolutely incredible.

I can quite believe that an exceptionally large quantity of the Blessed Sacrament would be reserved at the church of St. Sophia during the week before the Paschal festival in the year 404, because in such a vast city as Constantinople, mostly Christian, there would be a great number of sick and dying persons who would want to make their Easter Communion. In those days the official reservation of our Lord's Body and Blood had for its object to provide Communion for the sick and the *Viaticum* for the dying.

It will be interesting to contrast Fr. Freestone's deduction from the facts mentioned by St. Chrysostom with the conclusion which Cardinal Baronius, who died in 1607, draws from them. He would, of course, have been very glad to accept Fr. Freestone's hypothesis, had it occurred to him, if it had been possible to do so. Such an acceptance would have supplied him with an answer to those who might use the incident recorded by St. Chrysostom as corroborating the view that the Church in St. Chrysostom's age was *accustomed* to reserve the Sacrament under both kinds for the sick and dying; and in that way it would help him to defend the modern Roman practice of withholding the Chalice from the laity. But a historian like Baronius would see at once that to attempt to defend the modern Roman practice by such an argument would be fatal. The argument would be built upon sand. It it as clear as noonday that the Church in St. Chrysostom's day did reserve *sub utraque* for the sick and dying. Accordingly Baronius, as a true scholar, draws the right conclusion from St. Chrysostom's account. After quoting St. Chrysostom's words, he says (*Annales Ecclesiastici*, edit., Antwerp, 1638, tom. v., p. 196): "But here, reader, consider how far the heretics of our time, who deny that the most holy Eucharist ought to be reserved, vary from the tradition of the Fathers and from the usage of the Catholic Church; for we see that formerly the Eucharist was *customarily* reserved not only under the species of Bread, but also under the *species* of Wine. You have also this fact proved by the authority of St. Gregory, the Roman Pontiff, where he records that certain travellers by sea carried with them in the ship the Body and Blood of Christ." In this last sentence Baronius is obviously referring to St. Gregory's narrative of the actions of the Abbot Maximian and his monks, set forth above in Section VI. of this paper.

It is good to have Baronius's clear statement that the ancient custom of the Church was to reserve *sub utraque*. Of course, the proof is all there, in the commands of our Lord and in the testimony of the Fathers. But I have discovered that there are some people, who will listen to a Roman Cardinal, while they wave aside the commands of our Lord and the testimony of the Fathers.

VIII. We have seen what the custom of the Church was in St. Gregory the Great's day. Now that Pope was the Apostle of England, and when he sent St. Augustine with forty monks under him to be the evangelists of our nation, they would naturally carry with them the customs they had learnt in their holy house at Rome. In fact, Augustine was at one time

Maximian's right-hand man. When, after Gregory's elevation to the Papacy, Maximian was reappointed Abbot, he made Augustine his Prior.

But we need not depend on arguments based on probability. It is easy to show by facts that cannot be gainsaid, that during at least the first century of her existence, the Church of England was accustomed to reserve the Blessed Sacrament under both kinds for the sick.

Take, for example, the account which St. Bede gives to us of the death of St. Chad. Bede first tells us that St. Chad, a week before his death, predicted that he had only seven days more to live; and then he goes on (*Hist. Eccl. Gent. Angl.*, lib. iv., cap. iii., edit. Plummer, tom. i., p. 210) to say: "Immediately he began to suffer from bodily weakness, and this grew worse day by day, and on the seventh day according to the promise made to him, after he had prepared for his death by receiving the Body and Blood of the Lord, his holy soul, released from the prisonhouse of the body, took its flight to the heavenly joys." St. Chad died on March 2, 672.

IX. In St. Bede's *Vita St. Cuthberti* (cap. 39; *P.L.* xciv., 781) can be read the account of St. Cuthbert's death on the little island of Farne, about nine miles from Lindisfarne, which the Priest Herefrith, who was then Abbot of Lindisfarne, and was with St. Cuthbert when he died, gave to the Venerable Bede. St. Cuthbert died soon after midnight on March 20, 687; and Herefrith's account of the Saint's last moments runs thus: "But when the customary hour for the night-office had come, having received at my hands the saving Sacraments, he fortified his departure, which he knew had arrived, with the Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord; and, lifting his eyes to Heaven, and stretching out his hands upwards, he sent forth his soul, intent on catching the sound of the celestial anthems, to enter on the joys of the heavenly kingdom."

It is quite clear from Herefrith's account that he did not say Mass on the island of Farne on the day of St. Cuthbert's death in order to provide the *Viaticum* for St. Cuthbert; and it seems to follow that, when he came to Farne from Lindisfarne to minister to St. Cuthbert on his death-day, he must have brought with him the Reserved Sacrament under both kinds.

X. St. Bede, in his lives of the five holy Abbots of the double monastery of Wearmouth and Jarrow, describes the death of St. Benedict Biscop, the founder of those two sister-Houses. The death of the Saint took place not quite two years after the death of St. Cuthbert, on January 12, 689. Speaking of the last hours of his life, St. Bede says (*P.L.*, xciv., 725): "During the whole night for the relief of the sufferer's pain, the Gospel is read by a Presbyter. When the hour of death becomes imminent, the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord is given by way of Viaticum; and thus the holy soul set free flies away to the glory of the beatitude on high."

Thus we see that, as we might naturally expect, the Church of England, founded by missionaries sent from Rome, carried on the custom, observed not only at Rome, but throughout the Catholic Church, of reserving the Blessed Sacrament under both kinds for the sick and dying; so that the faithful might depart and be with Christ, having as their last act here below, fulfilled His command of eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood.

XI. Whereas during the earlier centuries, six at least, it was the universal custom to abstain from offering the Sacrifice and from the Communion on the Friday before the Pascha, a custom arose during the second half of the seventh century in the West of communicating on that Friday (which we now call Good Friday) from the Sacrament consecrated and

reserved on Maundy Thursday. When this custom first began, the Blessed Sacrament was, of course, reserved under both kinds. The so-called Gelasian Sacramentary is the earliest liturgical document that I know of, which contains the Order for what came later to be called The Mass of the Presanctified.

Mr. H. A. Wilson of Magdalen, who has brought out the best edition of this Sacramentary (Oxford, 1894), tells us in the beginning of his Introduction that the earliest remaining copy of it is preserved in the Vatican Library, and that it was most probably written in the seventh, or in the early years of the eighth century. On p. 77 of Mr. Wilson's edition the procedure is thus described in a Rubric: "When the above-written [intercessory] prayers are finished, the Deacons enter the *Sacrarium* (*i.e.*, the innermost sacristry, where the Blessed Sacrament was normally reserved). They proceed with the Body and Blood of the Lord, which remained over from the day before, and place them upon the Altar." The Rubric goes on to mention that the officiating Priest then venerates the Cross and kisses it. He then says the Lord's Prayer with its Preface and Embolism. Then all venerate the Cross and communicate.

Other liturgical documents of a later date exist, in which substantially the same directions are given, including the Reservation of the Sacrament *sub utraque*.

There is much more that I might write on this subject, but I cannot spend any more time on it, and I think that I have sufficiently proved that in the best and purest and holiest ages of the Church's history, the Blessed Sacrament was normally* reserved by the Clergy for the sick and dying under both kinds.

F. W. Puller, S.S.J.E.

II

Some Practical Considerations

An article on this subject by Fr. Puller appeared in the August number, in the form of a letter to "Mr. X," concerning certain matters on which he had asked for advice. My only excuse for begging a little space in your columns is that I am "Mr. X," and that the matter in question, which is of urgent practical importance, does not emerge very clearly from Fr. Puller's article. I yield to no one in respect for Fr. Puller's learning and scholarship, and in what follows I am simply stating the position of a Parish Priest who has to deal with the present-day problems of a large city parish.

* I say "normally," because there may have been exceptional cases here or there, in connection with which the Viaticum may, for special reasons, have been administered under one kind only. St. Bede in his description of the death of the poet-monk, Caedmon, in an out-house of St. Hilda's monastery at Whitby, seems to imply that he received under one kind only. At any rate no mention is made of any administration to him of the Sacrament of the Precious Blood (*cf.* St. Bede, *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Angl.*, lib. iv., cap. xxii : edit. Plummer, tom. i., pp. 261, 262). That normally the Viaticum was given *sub utraque* in the England of Bede's time has already been shown, and is corroborated conclusively by the story which Bede tells of a certain *layman* named Hildmer whose wife had gone mad, and was expected to die. Hildmer in great grief rode to the place where St. Cuthbert was staying, and begged the Saint to send a priest to visit his wife and "administer to her *the sacraments* of the Lord's Body and Blood" (*Vita St. Cuthberti*, cap. xv.: *P.L.*, xciv., 753).

Fr. Puller says that (1) For a thousand years and more the Church gave Communion *sub utraque;* (2) " For several hundred years in Rome and Alexandria the great majority of Christians had no opportunity of communicating oftener than once a week "; and (3) to give Communion under one kind is to commit " great sacrilege."

I desire to make three points: (1) There was no question whatever of giving Communion in one kind during Mass. That is, in my judgment, wholly indefensible in the Church of England. So far as I know, there is only a very insignificant number of people who even desire such a practice. (2) There is an increasing desire for Communion, and for more frequent Communion, among Church people. In these days, with reduced staffs of clergy, it is quite impossible to meet this demand by multiplying Eucharists. The practice of celebrating twice, or even three times, in one day is not only undesirable in itself, but an impossible strain on the clergy. The only alternatives are (*a*) to give Communion from the Reserved Sacrament; or (*b*) to refuse Communion. In this Parish about fifty or sixty Communions are made every week in this way. Fr. Puller's answer seems to be that I ought to refuse to give these Communions on the ground that in the earlier centuries Christians only received once a week. Is that a satisfactory answer ? Even if Fr. Puller is right about the custom at Rome and Alexandria, which appears to be doubtful,* I confess that I find it a " hard saying." I cannot imagine a Parish Priest feeling justified in refusing the Bread of Life to those who earnestly and reverently desire It, nor could I feel it right that those who are obliged to go to their daily work at an hour which makes attendance at the Holy Mysteries impossible should be penalized and suffer so grave a loss. The desire for more frequent Communion is one of the happiest and surest signs of a growing spirituality among us. Is it to be quenched or encouraged? There is also the case of those who can very seldom or never communicate at the ordinary times of Celebration, such as those who are engaged on farms, night-workers, police, some domestic servants, etc. Are we to be satisfied with our present quite inadequate provision for such people ?

The next point is this. If it is right to give Communion to the absent as well as the sick, from the Reserved Sacrament, must that Communion be given in both kinds ? On this question I should like to make the following suggestions: (1) I am asked to believe, if Fr. Puller is right, that " great sacrilege " is committed almost every day at every Altar in the Latin Church, and has been committed for many centuries. (2) That the same " sacrilege " is committed throughout the Orthodox Churches of the East. Whether or no the species of wine is preserved in the Eastern practice of Communion, there is certainly nothing that can literally answer to " drink this " which Fr. Puller regards as the Divine command. I confess again that I should find it difficult to believe that the Catholic Church, East and West, has for centuries been continually guilty of " great sacrilege."

In Fr. Puller's further article he gives a number of instances of Reservation *sub utraque.* I observe that the most modern instance is in the year 689. Of course, if the contention is true that " this was not done in the first seven centuries therefore it cannot be done now," then *cadit quæstio.* But is it ? It seems to me that the custom of more than 1,000 years gives

* Fr. Puller's statement on this point differs from that by Dr. Darwell Stone in his *The Holy Communion,* p. 234.

an impressive sanction to the present practice. If you were really to insist on Fr. Puller's point, we should have to alter a good many things in the Church of England!

But, indeed, there seems to be a good deal of evidence for Reservation under one kind from the very earliest times. The custom of reserving at home referred to by Tertullian, St. Cyprian, and St. Basil, appears to have been in the species of bread only, and the reservation mentioned by Dionysius of Alexandria and St. Optatus seems also to contemplate only one kind. No doubt there was a diversity of practice in different places, but in view of the stream of evidence for Reservation under one kind, used for the absent as well as the sick, and in view of the practice of 1,000 years, East and West, it seems impossible and unreasonable at the present day to brand as "great sacrilege" the custom of giving Communion under one kind to the absent or to the sick.

In request to the suggestion of reserving the Chalice, I should like to add the following considerations: (1) There is the practical difficulty that the wines commonly used now do not keep well. The interior of a Tabernacle, which is usually a metal safe, is very hot and airless, and, in some weathers at least, it would not be safe to assume that the wine would retain its condition even for twenty-four hours. It is a risk from which one naturally shrinks. (2) There is the inconvenience and delay which would be caused by using and cleansing two Chalices every morning. (3) It would be another point of difference from our brethren of the Latin Church. This consideration will pull different ways with different minds. There are those who are inclined to stress these differences, and are gravely suspicious of any closer alignment with Roman practice. There are others who are truly anxious, from the highest motives, to reduce those differences, and to foster a closer union as far as possible consistently with truth and loyalty. There are no doubt foolish people of both types, the blindly Roman and the blindly Protestant. But there are also those who are sane and wise, and who gladly welcome any approach to union which is not prohibited by false doctrine or by any meretricious attraction. (4) If it be admitted that the sick may receive under one kind, it is difficult to see why the absent should not do the same.

Finally, even if this practice is regarded as abnormal—and, in a sense, it undoubtedly is so—is it not required to meet our modern abnormal conditions? Every devout Christian would very much prefer to be present at the Holy Mysteries and to receive Communion in the normal way. That is becoming increasingly impossible in large town parishes with depleted staffs. There is a growing volume of real devotion and love for our Blessed Lord, as evidenced by the increasing desire for frequent Communion. I plead very earnestly that every Parish Priest be left free to provide the Bread of Life at any time to every reverent child of God who desires It in the way in which it has been done, at least in part, from the earliest times, and universally for 1,000 years or more.

FRANCIS BOYD.

III

Additional Note

I think that Mr. Boyd takes Fr. Puller's words in the August number a little too hardly: the phrase "great sacrilege" is a quotation from Pope Gelasius I. The whole passage is instructive. What the Pope is rebuking is evidently the individual caprice of some who, without any authority, were partaking only in one kind. But the words admit of a wider application. The question whether the Church's jurisdiction in matters of rite and ceremony extends to so fundamental a matter as receiving in one kind had not been raised in Gelasius' time; but his language leaves little doubt as to how he would have replied, if it had been. "The division of one and the same Mystery cannot take place without great sacrilege" is a quite objective statement of principle—viz., that, where the Divine ordinance is clear, the Church has no right to alter it.

That is undoubtedly the view of the Church of England; and we are glad that Mr. Boyd strongly deprecates the tendency in certain quarters to adopt the Roman custom. The "doctrine of concomitance" is indeed a poor shift to set against the definite precept and example of our Blessed Lord Himself. But Mr. Boyd's main point is with Reservation: should it be in one kind, or in both? A country priest, who has no experience of the real exigencies of which Mr. Boyd speaks, writes under a disadvantage; but the following points suggest themselves.

1. Both in the Roman Church and in the East, custom with regard to the Reserved Sacrament follows custom with regard to Communion within the Mass, and has no doubt grown out of it. This is consistent; and it would point to Reservation in both kinds in the Church of England.

2. The prescription of 1,000 years is a dangerous line of appeal. For the period takes us back to one of the worst ages of the Christian Church. And the appeal need prove no more than that bad customs once contracted take a long time to outgrow.

3. The "inconvenience and delay which would be caused by using and cleansing two Chalices every morning" is surely negligible compared with the importance of keeping as closely as possible to our Lord's ordinance. And the risk of which Mr. Boyd speaks in section (1) of his last paragraph but one is surely one that can be overcome by adequate arrangements.

Is not the clue to the situation to be found in history? The need for reserving has grown, and grown rapidly, without any adequate supervision from authority, if not in its despite. Inevitably clergy have turned to precedent for guidance, and Roman precedent was there, ready to hand; and its adoption, as the best expedient, followed. But it does not follow that when the Church of England, on the basis of its own more Scriptural custom, seriously applies itself to the matter, it will endorse the Roman method of reserving in one kind. It is much to be hoped, at any rate, that, when that time comes, the points which Mr. Boyd has put will be very carefully considered.

E. G. Selwyn.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Mr. A. E. Baker has given us interesting articles based on the "assumption" that "primitive Christianity was a mystery religion which happened to survive." It is hardly possible that anyone could pay so much attention to a theory until he thought it a fairly well-grounded theory. I hope, however, that Mr. Baker is going to follow up his first two articles by another on the evidence for the theory. I should then think the order in which he has chosen to treat the subject inconvenient, but I should try to school myself to submit to the evidence. But it so happens that some of us, and I among the number (with Mr. Edwyn Bevan's help), have been seeking to examine the evidence. We have found that, though the prevalence of the mystery religions had undoubtedly something to do with providing an atmosphere in which Christianity spread, and proved at the same time a considerable peril to its ethical purity, it had approximately nothing to do with its origin. And the supposed resemblances between the Christian sacraments and the heathen mysteries have been, by Loisy, for example, and Frayer, enormously exaggerated. Thus Mr. Baker says: "The worshippers of Zagreus ate the body of the God and drank his blood." We have shown (I venture to say) how totally without support in the literature of the period, when Christianity arose and began to spread, such an idea was. Cicero, for instance, treats the ideas of theophagy as unheard of.* The evidence shows that the ideas attached to the Christian sacraments in the New Testament had a quite different origin from the pagan mysteries. You say that Mr. Baker's first article "gave some the impression that its author was a Modernist; but we do not think that the second will bear that out." Now I should not, from previous experience, imagine Mr. Baker to be a Modernist, but I think that alike in his first and his second article he has followed the dangerous precedent of some Modernists in following ideas with a strange disregard of the evidence.

CHARLES GORE.

ORIENTALIA

OF all customs and ceremonies in the Orthodox Church, the one that most offends the old-fashioned Anglican is the habit of reverence (to use no stronger word) for eikons. To one familiar from infancy with the wording of the second commandment, and educated in an atmosphere which borrows much—though unconsciously—from the "Homily against Peril of Idolatry," much that one sees in an Orthodox Church jars even more than what one sees in a Latin one.

Now, we do not propose to defend the practice or enter into controversy; but merely to recount facts that may enable the Western to understand the existence of what he cannot approve; for the facts are simply that—the thing works; worshippers who appeal to eikons for help in their need can point to help granted in fact; help granted in a way that, explain i t how we may in the language of Western philosophy, may at least enable

* The evidence is examined in *The Holy Spirit and the Church* (John Murray, chapter iii., and Appendix, note A).

us to understand the persistence of the thing in the mind of the unsophisticated Eastern.

Let us take a case or two of recent occurrence. It is not ten years since the late King Constantine of Greece was very ill, afflicted by an abscess which was bad enough to threaten life, and on which—by reason of its position among other things—the doctors dared not operate. He had practically been given up, when as a last resource they brought the eikon of " Our Lady of Tenos " to his bedside.

This particular eikon comes from a shrine famous throughout Greece for the cures undoubtedly wrought there, and which has certainly been a place of healing for long enough, for it stands, we believe, on the site of a classical temple of Asclepius.

The eikon was brought by Bishops from its shrine to Piræus, and was escorted up the long hot road to Athens by a procession of barefooted worshippers of all classes of society. It was brought into the bedroom of the patient, and the sick king, in defiance of all the orders of his doctors, raised himself to sitting posture, bent forward, and kissed the eikon with all reverence. The exertion broke the abscess that the doctors had not dared to touch, immediate relief followed, and recovery in due course. " Purely natural causes," no doubt, and no doubt many, too, spoke of Greece being " cursed with the burden of a granted prayer," but—the thing happened. For the moment we are not discussing how it happened, but are trying to understand why the uneducated should believe so devoutly in the " miraculous " power of the eikon.

Take other cases. Twice, in the course of the summer of 1924, destructive forest fires have broken out on Mount Athos, and on each occasion folk have had recourse to an eikon of distinguished sanctity, and have got what they wanted, *post* if not *propter illud*.

On one occasion the great monastery of " the Lavra " (*i.e.*, *the* monastery, for it is the original mother-house of the Holy Mountain) found a fire raging on the hills above the house, and destroying much valuable timber. They had recourse to an ancient eikon that goes by the incredible name of " Our Lady Beans-and-Peas " (*Koukouzelissa*), and set it in the path of the fire.

The eikon gets its extraordinary name, one may mention, from a worshipper and from no special quality of its own. An ignorant but very pious monk in the fifteenth century was known by the nickname of " Koukouzele," from his favourite diet; he said his prayers night and day before this picture with such devotion that at last the picture—so saith tradition—stretched out its hand and gave him a gold piece, and this, as Jack Cade said of the bricks, " is alive to this day to testify to it, wherefore deny it not." Think what you like of the monk and his gold byzant, but when the picture was put in the path of the fire, the fire stopped, and could easily be finally extinguished. Another case occurred in the May of this year. Some readers of the magazine may have seen in the papers reference to the destruction of the monastery of " Khiliandari " on Mount Athos by fire. The monastery is, in fact, quite uninjured, but the writer can certainly testify to the fact that when he visited it in the month of June, one could see by the burnt trees that the fire had swept through the pine woods right up to the very outbuildings of the monastery, and had stopped. The Guest-Master of the place explained what had happened readily enough, and told how, with a strong wind behind it, the fire swept down the hill, and how all thought that the monastery buildings—which

are built of wood as far as the upper storeys go—were doomed. Again they had recourse to the eikon, taking out in this case the picture of "Our Lady of the Three Hands" (so called because the severed hand of St. John Damascene is introduced into the composition), and again put it, with prayers, in the path of the fire—and the wind changed and the building was preserved.

Of course, it is easy enough to say—mere coincidence, and natural causes. We do not propose to argue the point, though one would like to enter a caveat against overuse of the coincidence argument! The arm of coincidence is proverbially long, but one must not strain it till it comes clean out of the socket! What we are concerned with for the moment is this: How are we to account for the persistence of the belief in the power of the eikons in the mind of the uneducated? Surely, when things like this happen, when, to put the matter vulgarly, the eikons play up so well, can one wonder that the belief in their power continues?

The change from the old to the new calendar has been made by authority and officially; all feasts are celebrated by the new rule. Naturally, however, conservative peasants, who have been accustomed to begin ploughing or olive harvest on a certain saint's day, do not fit themselves too readily to a change, and urge, like English farmers, that "the cows won't keep summertime." Can a land where the legal profession still counts from "*Old* Michaelmas Day" wonder at this? Conservative monasteries often refuse to recognize the change, saying that no authority short of an œcumenical council of the whole Orthodox Church has authority to tamper with the calendar.

One dear old monk of the writer's acquaintance went even further. "I tell you the truth," he said darkly, "the Blessed Virgin *does not like* this new calendar. St. George does not like it either. There was a Modernist priest in a church, and he said the Office for St. George's feast on the new-fangled day—and St. George fell down flat, and he was very sick." Enquiry proved that it was the priest, and not the saint, who was so startlingly affected; but "poor St. George," said a sympathizing Layman of the Church of England, "who would ever have thought that it would have taken him that way?"

There are, however, people who are affected by the new calendar, and who feel that it creates a position that will cause them some anxiety; these are the British officials in Jerusalem.

Easter-tide is always a time of peril there, for everyone knows how fanaticism is apt to boil over then, and how often the "Church of the Holy Sepulchre" has been disgraced by riots between Latins and Orientals. Now, if this was the case of old, when at least each party had their own day, how much greater will be the opportunity for friction when all Easters coincide, and so many zealots who are looking for a cause of quarrel with their opponents are gathered in the one confined space at the one time!

W. A. Wigram.

REVIEWS

Le Siège Apostolique, a.d. 359-461. Par Pierre Batiffol. Paris, 1924.

In this volume the author completes his account of *Le Catholicisme: des origines à Saint Leon.* In *L'Église naissante* (1909) he traced them as far as St. Cyprian. In *La Paix Constantinienne* (1914) he dealt with the relations between Catholicism and the Empire from the time when Constantine gave the Church its liberty till the day when Constantius II. gave Catholics a foretaste of what Cæsaropapism would be like under Justinian; and, at the Council of Ariminum (359), forced the Homœan variety of Arianism upon Christendom. *Le Catholicisme de Saint Augustin* (1920) came next, and is a study of ecclesiology—*i.e.*, of the doctrine of the constitution of the Church, as found in the greatest of Western Doctors. *Le Siège Apostolique* (1924) completes the series; and is a study of the reaction of Catholicism against the double tyranny of governmental control and of heresy. The Church was confronted, under Constantius, with " une crise, crise très grave "; but the crisis " se resout dans la conscience que l'Église prend de son indépendance spirituelle en face du prince chrétien, dans la perception de plus en plus claire que la communion avec le Siège apostolique est la condition de l'intégrité de la foi et de l'unité de l'Église, dans l'adhésion de l'Orient à cette ecclésiologie de l'Occident."* So the author describes the thesis of his fourth book in his preface to the third. The whole work, as he writes in the preface to the fourth volume, may be described as an " histoire du *principatus* romain,"† which Mgr. Duchesne had long desired to see written; and the fourth book is a description of " l'avènement de ce *principatus.*" This *principatus* reached the goal of its development with St. Leo (440-461), and was accepted, according to Mgr. Batiffol, at the Council of Chalcedon " ou l'empereur Marcien lui rend avec tout le catholicisme grec un si solennel hommage." But Greeks only recognized Popes when they wanted their assistance; and there was no guarantee that subsequent emperors would be as loyal to Catholicism as Marcian. Besides, there were autonomous Churches beyond the eastern frontiers of the Empire. It looked as if the recognition of the Roman *principatus*, as the centre of unity, was likely to be as uncertain in the future as it was limited in the present. What, then, would become of the

* *Le Catholicisme de S. Augustin*, p. v.
† *Le Siège apostolique*, p. v.

Apostolic See as the centre of unity? St. Leo's success might be but momentary. "Mais cet achèvement ce double d'une doctrine qui seule l'explique. Saint Léon revendique la sollicitude de l'Église universelle *ex divina institutione*. . . .* Il revendique le droit de dire à l'Église universelle en matière de foi *quid divinitus traditum teneamus et quid incommutabiliter prædicemus* . . . aucun pape avant St. Léon n'a parlé avec tant d'autorité." And Mgr. Batiffol concludes his preface by dedicating his "études" "aux théologiens anglais qu'il nous fut donné de rencontrer en novembre dernier à Malines, et avec qui nous entretenions du droit divin et du rôle historique de la papauté."†

It is hardly necessary to say that the thesis, so frankly set forth, is supported by a detailed survey of the century that elapsed between Damasus and Leo, done with great skill and accuracy. St. Ambrose (374-397) is taken first as the centre of interest during the last quarter of the fourth century. He stands for the Roman ecclesiology; and also, in the wake of St. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers (350-368), and Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari (353-370), for "the freedom of the Church from control by the State." The Council of Constantinople (381) marks a tendency on the part of the East to pursue its own course.‡ But the West found its centre in Rome; and it is next shown how the Apostolic See was responsible not only for dealing with its own *regiones suburbicariæ*, as in the case of the letter of Pope Innocent I. to Decentius, Bishop of Eugubium, written in 416, but for decisions taken in North Italy, with respect to Jovinian; in Spain, with respect to Priscillianism; in Gaul, with respect to the primacy of Arles; in Africa, with respect to Pelagianism; and in Illyricum, where Pope Boniface I., writing March 11, 422 to the bishops of his Vicariate there, who ventured to question a decision of the Apostolic See, reminds them that, though the episcopate is indeed one, yet they ought to know "quibus, caritate servata, propter ecclesiasticam disciplinam, debeant esse subjecti."§ To treat bishops as "subjects" was to reverse the principle of equality among bishops which Cyprian found in the Apostles being "pari consortio prædíti et honoris et potestatis,"‖ and to anticipate the doctrine of the relation between the episcopate and the papacy as formulated by St. Leo —"quoniam et inter beatissimos apostolos in similitudine honoris fuit quædam discretio potestatis."¶ So far chapter iv. In chapters v., vi. the author turns his attention once more to the

* Leo, *Ep.* xiv. c. 1 (*Op.* i. 683; *P.L.* liv. 668 B).
† *Le Siège apostolique*, p. vii.
‡ *Ibid.*, cc. i., ii.
§ Boniface, *Ep.* xv., § 5 (*P.L.* xx. 782 A).
‖ Cyprian, *De cath. eccl. unitate*, § 4.
¶ Leo, *Ep.* xiv., § 11 (*Op.* i. 691; *P.L.* liv. 676 A).

East; and shows how Rome was the refuge of those who sought aid against the Imperial Court—of Chrysostom against his persecution by Arcadius and of Cyril in the struggle with Nestorius supported by Theodosius II. Finally, we arrive at the pontificate of St. Leo. Mgr. Batiffol takes note of Leo's theory of the authority of his see, how it is the authority of Peter himself—"cuius in sede sua vivit potestas et excellit auctoritas";* and of its relation to the authority of other bishops, summed up in his reminder to Anastasius, Bishop of Thessalonica, and papal vicar in Illyricum, "Vices nostras ita tuæ credidimus caritati, ut in partem sis vocatus sollicitudinis, non in plenitudinem potestatis."† Such a "plenitudo potestatis," it is then concluded, the East accepted at Chalcedon; and has since gone back upon it.

Mgr. Batiffol does not ignore the difficulties attendant upon this reading of the history. He notes how Cyprian's theory was modified by that of Boniface and Leo, which superseded it. He reckons with the African claim to autonomy. He records how, at the fourth session of the Council of Chalcedon, on October 17, 451, each bishop, as he gave his *sententia* upon the *Tome* of St. Leo, declared "que la foi de l'archiévêque de Rome Léon, était celle de Nicée, de Constantinople, de Cyrille, et qu'il y souscrivait."‡ And he acknowledges the lack of interest in the Roman see displayed by Orientals except when they wanted its support. Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylæum, for instance, used language "adéquat au sentiment du catholicisme grec, habitué à considerer le Siège apostolique comme le secours auquel on peut appeler avec confiance, quand ce catholicisme grec ne peut se secourir par ses propres moyens."§ He confines the Roman authority to questions of faith. "Sur des points de foi comme ceux qu'a touchés Jovinien, Milan entend conformer sa doctrine à celle de l'evêque de Rome, 'maitre et docteur.'"‖ Or again, "Le Siège apostolique ne démande pas davantage à l'Afrique catholique, la communauté de foi étant sauve."¶ And he admits that other churches, subject to this limitation, took and were allowed a large amount of freedom, as was the case with non-suburbicarian Italy. "Saint Ambroise est le représentant le meilleur de cette attitude."** All this is frank and hopeful; and it would be a good thing if all Anglicans, anxious for reunion with the Roman see as with other parts of Christendom, would read Mgr. Batiffol's presentation of the case, and

* Leo, *Sermo* iii., § 3 (*Op.* i. 12; *P.L.* liv. 146 C).
† Leo, *Ep.* xiv., c. 1 (*Op.* i. 686; *P.L.* liv. 671 B).
‡ *Le Siège apostolique*, 545. § *Ibid.*, 516.
‖ *Ibid.*, 174. For "magistrum et doctorem" of Pope Siricius, see Ambrose *Ep.* xlii., § 12 (*Op.* I. ii. 969; *P.L.* xvi. 1128 A).
¶ *Ibid.*, 234. ** *Ibid.*, 177.

recognize how much weightier is the evidence he can produce for it than we commonly suppose.

But, nevertheless, the author is sometimes as influenced by his traditions as we are by ours. Callistus (217-222) is the first Pope recorded to have quoted the *Tu es Petrus* in support of his authority; but the authority for which he claims it is his authority as bishop to forgive sins.* Stephen (254-257), so far as we know, was the first Pope to appeal to it in justification of his claim to occupy by succession the chair of Peter,† and to be "episcopus episcoporum."‡ By the time of Damasus the reference to Peter, in support of the universal authority of the Roman See, had become common form with Popes; and we can scarcely fail to notice that most of the evidence quoted in its favour (359-461) comes from papal letters or legates, or from Western prelates, such as Peter Chrysologus,§ Bishop of Ravenna (433-450), who were influenced by the current view.

It must be confessed that our author, with all his learning and candour, sometimes fails to give due weight to balancing considerations. Thus he is anxious to show that "l'Église romaine est l'église avec laquelle," according to St. Ambrose, "il faut être en communion pour appartenir à l'église catholique";‖ and he quotes the story of Satyrus, brother of St. Ambrose, who, for fear that the bishop of whom he sought baptism might belong to the Luciferian schism, asked him, first, "utrumnam cum episcopis catholicis, hoc est, cum romana ecclesia conveniret."¶ But Mgr. Batiffol forgets not, indeed, that Satyrus had just been shipwrecked in Sardinia, but that Sardinia was part of the Roman patriarchate, where, of course, no one could be a Catholic who was not in communion with the Bishop of Rome. Again, in the well-known case of the condemnation of Pelagius by Africa and Rome, he tells how replies** came from Rome in answer to the resolutions of the two Councils of Carthage and Milevum (416); so that Augustine could declare, in a sermon of September 23, 417, "causa finita est."†† But he forgets that, according to Augustine, writing in 418, the repudiation of Pelagianism was the joint work of "episcopalia concilia, et Apostolicam Sedem, universamque Romanam

* Tertullian, *De pudicitia*, c. xxi. (*C.S.E.L.* xx. 269 *seqq.*).

† Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxv., § 17 (*C.S.E.L.* III. ii. 821).

‡ Council of Carthage, September 1, 256 (*ibid.*, III. i. 435).

§ See his letter to Eutyches *ap.* Leo, *Ep.* xxv., § 2 (*Op.* i. 779; *P.L.* liv. 743 A), quoted in *Le Siège apostolique*, 446.

‖ *Le Siège apostolique*, 23.

¶ Ambrose, *De excessu fratris Satyri*, i., § 47 (*Op.* II. i. 1127; *P.L.* xvi. 1306 A).

** "Rescripta." For "resolutions" we should expect "relationes," but Augustine does not use the word here.

†† Augustine, *Sermo* cxxxi., § 10 (*Op.* v. 645 D; *P.L.* xxxviii. 734); and *Le Siège apostolique*, 239.

Ecclesiam, Romanumque Imperium, quod Deo propitio christianum est";* and that, four years later, Augustine refers once more to what settled the matter, and—using the very phrase so often applied to the part played by Rome alone—says, "Vestra vero apud competens judicium communium episcoporum modo causa finita est."†

Further, our author scarcely sees the significance‡ of *Constituimus*,§ in which, on a point of doctrine, the African Synod of November, 417, repudiated the decision of a living Pope, Zosimus, in favour of the pronouncement of his predecessor, Innocent I.; while he only refers in a note‖ to *Optaremus*, in which another African Synod of 424 rather roughly resented the intervention of Pope Cœlestine in the case of Apiarius—"Nisi forte quisquam est qui credat, unicuilibet posse Deum nostrum examinis inspirare justitiam et innumerabilibus congregatis in concilium sacerdotibus denegare."¶ It is inconceivable that the Africans could have written in this tone if they had held the theory of the papal authority, then finding acceptance across the sea, and soon to be finally formulated by St. Leo.

It seems also that the successive cases of application to Rome are instinctively taken by our author as if, one by one, they involved the Petrine theory of the Pope's authority, whereas many do not involve more than that it was felt to be important to enlist the aid of the Roman rather than of any other see;** while appeal is often made to Rome and to other sees, not only at the same time but by duplicates of the letters sent to Rome. St. Chrysostom, for example, when he was in trouble, did not regard the Roman See as the only centre of ecclesiastical justice; for he sent three copies of the same letter, asking for assistance, to the three great prelates of Rome, Milan, and Aquileia;†† while the Priscillianists made interest with Ambrose as well as with Damasus.‡‡

But I only adduce these points to show that though the

* Augustine, *De pecc. orig.*, § 18 (*Op.* x.; *P.L.* xliv. 394).

† Augustine, *Contra Jul. Pel.*, III. i., § 5 (*Op.* x.; *P.L.* xliv. 704).

‡ *Le Siège apostolique*, 240.

§ See it among "Varia scripta ad hist. Pel. pert." in Augustine's *Op.* x., app. 102 D, E (*P.L.* xlv. 1723 *seqq.*).

‖ *Le Siège apostolique*, 242, n. 2. ¶ Mansi, iii. 842 C.

** Theodoret, for instance, in 449, asks for the help of Leo because his "chair is adorned with many advantages"; it is the chair of a great, populous, and imperial city; faith adorns it (Rom. i. 8); and so do the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul. But there is not a word of St. Leo's position as Supreme Pastor and Judge; see Theodoret, *Ep.* cxiii. (*Op.* iv. 1187-92; *P.G.* lxxxiii. 1311-8). Mgr. Batiffol's note 2 on p. 518 is instructive; the one reason that Leo himself would give for his primacy is conspicuous by its absence in Theodoret's letter.

†† Palladius, *Vita*, c. ii. *ad fin.* (*Op.* I. i.; *P.G.* xlvii. 12); see Batiffol, 313 *seqq.*, whose note 2 is frank.

‡‡ *Le Siège apostolique*, 192.

author's thesis has many facts in its favour, there are others which will not fit into its framework. We owe much to St. Leo and his eagerness to "keep the unity";* and I believe that, if both sides of Leo's theory could be given equal weight, a way to reconciliation may still be found within its terms. The episcopate is a college, and every college has its president. He cannot act without his colleagues, for they have equal rights with him. Nor can they act alone: for he is their head. Cyprian himself asks Pope Stephen to take the lead in dealing with the Novatianist Marcian, Bishop of Arles, and expressly recognizes the Pope as leader of the episcopal "college," who naturally acts for "the rest."† Such leadership, or primacy, the Anglican Church has never denied to the Papacy, though perhaps we have sometimes dealt with it as roughly as the Africans in their day: English and Africans alike under severe provocation! Now the papal powers have repeatedly been affirmed to be compatible with episcopal rights. They are limited by Leo I., who describes the Bishops as "consortes honoris sui"‡ (sc. Petri). "Tantum abest," says the Vatican Council; "ut hæc summi pontificis officiat ordinariæ ac immediatæ illi episcopalis jurisdictionis potestati qua episcopi qui positi a Spiritu sancto in apostolorum locum successerunt, tanquam veri pastores . . . regunt."§ And, again, Leo XIII. speaks of the Bishops as "non tamen *vicarii* Romanorum Pontificum, quia potestatem gerunt sibi propriam, verissimique populorum quos regunt antistites *ordinarii* dicuntur."‖ Within these limits, then, room might still be found for an ultimate reconciliation. As it is, we each tend to look upon our own side of the shield—to mere papalism or to mere episcopacy—to the exclusion of the other. Is it too much to hope that, if Mgr. Batiffol and we "théologiens anglicans" should meet again at Malines under the chairmanship of that gracious Cardinal, we may, in loyalty to all the facts on either side, make further progress towards such a conception of the constitution of the Church as would make room for us both within its common home?

B. J. Kidd.

* *Eph.* iv. 23. For this eagerness as determining Leo's policy see Batiffol, p. 577: a paragraph with which I entirely agee. The danger, in view, was the rise of the See of Constantinople, 381-451.

† *Ep.* lxviii., § 3 (*C.S.E.L.* III. ii. 75 *seqq.*).

‡ Leo, *Sermo* ii., c. 2 (*Op.* i. 9; *P.L.* liv. 144 A); Batiffol, 419.

§ *Const. dogm.*, I. *De eccl. Christi*, c. 3.

‖ *Satis cognitum*, § 14.

ENGLISH THEOLOGIANS

EDITED BY S. L. OLLARD, M.A., AND W. SPENS, M.A.

RICHARD HOOKER. By L. S. Thornton, M.A. 4s.
ROBERT SANDERSON. By George Lewis. 6s.
BISHOP BUTLER. By Albert E. Baker. 4s. 6d.
THE LADY JULIAN. A Psychological Study. By Robert H. Thouless, M.A., Ph.D. 4s. 6d.

We must, indeed, congratulate the S.P.C.K. on the high standard of the first four volumes of this new series of English Theologians. If the level can be maintained, the series should fill an important place in modern theological literature, and both in outlook and in subject matter represent Anglicanism at its best.

There is a real danger that by the modern generation the writings of Hooker should come to be considered only as a subject for examinations, to be crammed up in a text-book and then dismissed. Father Thornton's book should go a long way to remedy this misapprehension. It does not attempt to compete with such a work as Bishop Paget's introduction or to cover all the ground. Rather it gives us a point of view, drawing out with great clearness the vital points of Hooker's theological system, and showing their value for the theological discussions of our own day. It must be admitted that there are many pages in the Ecclesiastical Polity that deal with details which have now lost their importance. The student may easily lose his way and his interest in the intricacies of obsolete controversy, and not even the exquisite Elizabethan English can prevent his attention from wandering from the long-drawn discussions of a more leisurely age. What is wanted is a guide to point out the salient features round which the rest may be grouped and to direct attention to the underlying principles. For this purpose Father Thornton is admirable. He makes Hooker's theology live, or rather convinces us that it has never been dead.

If there are two questions at the present day that call urgently for clear thinking, they are first the problem of the relation between the human and the divine, the natural and the supernatural, which finds its climax in the theology of the Incarnation, and secondly the kindred problem of the relation between the inward and the outward which underlies the whole discussion of institutional religion and Church unity and even the Christian attitude to social questions. On all these points this book shows that Hooker has much to say that is illuminating. Time has not destroyed its value because he has gone down to the root of the matter.

It would be unfair to attempt to summarize Father Thornton's able treatment of these problems. Where there is so much that is excellent it seems ungracious to pick holes. Our chief regret is that the book is not about twice as long as it is. That would have given room for a fuller treatment of certain vexed questions which are dismissed somewhat summarily. While we are in full agreement with his searching criticism of the tendencies of Protestant Christology, we wish that he had found room for an appreciation of the positive values of Protestantism, which must be preserved in any final synthesis. Perhaps here Hooker is more Catholic than his commentator. We should have also welcomed a fuller development of the anti-Roman side of Hooker's teaching. He rightly insists that Hooker's "life-work was above all else a great appeal to reason in matters of religion." But this appeal was needed not only against Geneva but against Rome. To-day the danger is not the Puritan appeal to the letter of Scripture; it is rather the attempt within the Church of England to misuse the authority of the Church in the same manner as the Puritans misused the authority of Scripture. He speaks of "that hard, dogmatic logic which the English Puritans learned from Calvin and yet so strangely shared with the Tridentine Fathers." To-day reasonable Christianity has more to fear from the logic of Trent than the logic of Geneva. Again, any treatment of Hooker's somewhat peculiar receptionist theology of the Eucharist should find room for the famous sentence: "The power of the ministry of God . . . by blessing visible elements . . . maketh them invisible grace." We confess that on p. 60 the turn of the sentence leaves us wondering whether the author approves or disapproves of the teaching that "Christ's glorified body can be present wherever He wills, for example in every celebration of the Eucharist." Nor do we anywhere get the smallest assistance towards understanding Hooker's obscure statements about the omnipresence of Christ's manhood "by co-operation."

We must end by commending the book heartily as a most valuable and timely contribution to theological study. We hope that it will be widely read, not least by candidates for ordination.

If the name, at least, of Hooker is known to educated Churchmen, that of Sanderson is, we fear, little familiar. In his careful and painstaking volume Mr. Lewis gives a thorough and attractive account of the man in relation to his environment, which we hope will do much to revive his memory. He was a great and good man of whom the Church of England may well be proud. A study of his writings is specially appropriate at a time when there is a widespread feeling of the need of an Anglican

moral theology. The practice of importing lumps of Roman Catholic moral theology and attempting to apply them to the conditions of English Church life, which are in many respects, and often happily, different from those of the Roman Communion, is increasingly recognized to be unsatisfactory. Sanderson's reputation in large measure rested on his skill as a spiritual director, and he is one of the few Anglican divines on whom it is possible to draw for help. In this volume he is allowed to speak for himself and there is little criticism or discussion of his moral teaching. We should perhaps have expected more than a passing allusion to the modern psychological views of instinct and their bearing on the nature of conscience. And we could wish for a reference to some more solid work on this subject than the small text-book mentioned on p. 118. But these omissions do not detract from the value of what we are given. It is no mean task to have given a clear account of such an intricate period. We hope that the book will have the circulation that it deserves.

We confess that when we opened Mr. A. E. Baker's book on Bishop Butler, we wondered whether there was still room for yet another book on this subject. But the reading of a few chapters soon showed that he had much to say that was worth saying and said it well. We regard this as quite the best account of Butler's theology to be found within the covers of a single volume. We say theology advisedly and not ethics, because the book is primarily a study of his theological rather than his moral outlook, though the two are intimately connected.

Perhaps we in our generation are peculiarly fitted to appreciate the excellencies of Butler's methods. Many details of his arguments are out of date and must be frankly recognized as such. But his temper and mind can never be out of date, and are specially required amid the perplexities and uncertainties of to-day. Mr. Baker sums up well the importance of Butler as the typical embodiment of a true Christian agnosticism. "The characteristic contribution of Anglicanism to man's thought of God is this humble trust which rejects the too easy way of those who are content to start from external infallibilities, refuses to shut its eyes to the mysteries of life, but finds in conscience, God's vicar, educated by the Church's fellowship and authority, nourished and inspired by Holy Scripture, enlightened and judged by reason, the sufficient light in the darkness of this earthly life." We could not wish for the English Church at this critical period of its life a higher ideal than that of faithfulness to its own tradition in the past. We must thank Mr. Baker for a book which will serve to lead men to a wise and alert study of one who is our most typical Anglican theologian.

The Lady Julian would be vastly surprised to find herself among the "Theologians" and to hear her biographer apologizing for her presence by saying that she had no place among them. But we welcome the intrusion both for its own sake because it encourages a further acquaintance with one of the most attractive of our English mystics, and also because it affords Dr. Thouless the opportunity for a most clear and interesting psychological study. And the indirect gain to theology is enormous. Apart from the fact that theology depends on religion, no theologian can ignore the importance of the differences between verbal and visual thinking for the dangers that may result from the use of concrete imagery and the more subtle dangers that lurk behind thinking in words. On all these subjects and on many others Dr. Thouless has much to say that needs consideration. The book is not only an introduction to the reading of the Lady Julian herself but to the modern psychology of religion by one who is specially qualified to speak on the subject. For both purposes we can thoroughly recommend it.

E. J. Bicknell.

NOTICES

Cosmology. An Introduction to the Philosophy of Matter. By the Rev. J. O'Neill. Vol. I. The Greeks and the Aristotelian Schoolmen: Longmans, Green and Co. 12s. 6d.

Dr. O'Neill's title describes the contents of his volume with admirable accuracy. What he undertakes to describe is simply one part of a very large subject, the growth of the Aristotelian *Naturphilosophie* from the first crude guesses of the Ionians, its adoption in a Christianized form by Albert the Great and St. Thomas in the thirteenth century, and the fortunes of the doctrine down to the general discrediting of it by Humanists and followers of the "new" science, a fate which, as the author says, was partly deserved in so far as the Aristotelian *Naturlehre* was based on a false mechanics and developed without constant experimental control, partly undeserved in so far as the Humanist opposition to the "School" was the outcome of the frivolous journalistic type of mind which prefers catch-penny epigrams to solid wrestling with intellectual problems. It follows from the nature of this programme that the exposition starts with Albert and St. Thomas, and that the outstanding later figures in the story, apart from commentators who are strictly Thomist, are Scotus and Suarez, and to a lesser degree Ockham. As a guide to the main cosmological positions of Thomas, Scotus, and Suarez, Dr. O'Neill is highly to be commended for patience and clarity of exposition and marked impartiality. Presumably his book is, in the first instance, intended as a manual for colleges in which the Thomistic philosophy is taught, but any student of the history of philosophy and natural science, whatever his own philosophical allegiance, will find it most valuable as a work of reference covering a vast tract of ground in which it is not given to many of us to be masters. If there is any direction in which one could have wished the information to be fuller,

perhaps one might regret the comparative neglect of the specifically scientific continental Ockhamists, Baridau, Nicholas Oresme, Albert of Saxony, who did so much to prepare the way for Galileo's "new science." But Dr. O'Neill would perhaps say, with some justification, that kinetics and kinematics are not quite the same thing as the general philosophy of nature, and that it is the latter only with which he professes to deal. I would specially recommend to the more general reader the two concluding chapters which deal respectively with the general conception of "motion" common to the Aristotelian schoolman, and with the humanistic and scientific reaction against the school.

The limits set by the author himself to his subject necessarily lead to the exclusion of matter which would be specially interesting to most English readers. In a work specially devoted to *Aristotelian* scholasticism we naturally hear little or nothing of the great Augustinian thinkers of the thirteenth century, Bonaventure and the rest, though the most solid work of the whole middle age in science was mostly done by the Oxford followers of the Augustinian tradition of whom Roger Bacon is the most distinguished, or of the so-called "light-metaphysic" which lies at the bottom of their best work. This silence is fully explicable in a work which announces itself as strictly a study of the Greeks and the Christian Aristotelians, but it is to be hoped that general readers will not fall into the mistake, against which Dr. O'Neill has carefully warned them by his title, of taking the book as a complete account of mediæval cosmology as a whole. I should not think it necessary to make the remark were it not that there is a tendency in this country at least to forget that, with all the greatness of Thomas, he must not be taken as the complete embodiment of the philosophical and scientific thought of "scholasticism." We must not say "the schoolmen teach," when what we really mean is that "St. Thomas, or St. Thomas and his followers, have taught," any more than we may say "the nineteenth century taught" when we only mean "Hegel (or Comte, or Spencer) taught."

In some respects Dr. O'Neill's printer and proof-reader have not served him any too well. It is annoying to read twice on the same page of a "*principle* agent" (p. 152), or of "*uniting*" a knot, when what is meant is *untying* it (p. 267), and these are not the only *errata* of this type. I suppose it is Dr. O'Neill himself who is responsible for the oversight at p. 185, where there is a verbal implication that Alexander of Hales—in a spirit of prophecy, perhaps—criticized certain speculations of Durandus about the Eucharist. What is really meant is that Suarez, who did criticize these speculations, fell back on Alexander of Hales for a different theory.

The opening chapters which treat of pre-Christian Greek cosmology are perhaps hardly up to the level of the best parts of the book. Here Dr. O'Neill is plainly dealing with his material at second-hand, and though he has done his best to base himself on good authorities, his authorities are inevitably neither all equally recent, nor all equally good, and the attempt to "combine the information" sometimes leads to results which none of them would countenance. If I may say so, I could wish that Newton's apocalyptic extravagances had not been made the occasion for a heavily humorous satire on Protestant anti-papal prejudices (pp. 31-34). After all, there were other crazy interpretations of St. John in which it was Luther who figured as "the beast." No Church or School has a monopoly of nonsense, and none, I believe, has officially adopted the nonsense which

has been talked by its own adherents on this particular subject. Dr. O'Neill promises a second volume in which it is to be shown that when we reject everything in the Thomist cosmology which is due to the defective natural science of the middle ages and their uncritical reliance on Aristotle, the main principles of the Thomist *philosophy* of nature will be found more in accordance with empirical fact than those of any of its later rivals. Since the "philosophy" which satisfied the nineteenth century has manifestly broken down, and the physicists themselves are increasingly in revolt against the Comtist ideal of a natural science which has no metaphysical background, there is at least a fair field open to the Thomist, and one would be honestly gratified by an attempt to work it thoroughly.

A. E. Taylor.

The New Testament of To-Day. By Ernest Findlay Scott, D.D. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1921. 4s.

Professor Scott is known to English students of the New Testament from his books on the Fourth Gospel, on the Epistle to the Hebrews, and on the idea of the Messiah and the Kingdom of God in the Synoptic Gospels; he is known to the younger generation of American theological students primarily as an inspiring teacher. This little book, which is hardly more than a pamphlet, is the professor's apology for dedicating his life to the interpretation of the New Testament. The following are the main points of the book. The literature of Primitive Christianity has essential importance for the modern world because it stands for the element of permanence in Christianity, and gives a consistency of aim and direction to Christian progress; because it maintains the historical foundation of the Gospel, and preserves it from being resolved into an allegory of redemption; and because the record of the enthusiasm of the Apostles and of their intuitive grasp of ultimate realities has proved of incalculable value in human experience (chap. i.).

The historical critical study of the New Testament is necessary in order that the permanent element in primitive Christianity may be distinguished from that which was either assimilated from the Pagan world or the product of contemporary controversy (chap. ii.). The main results of the critical study of Christian origins are that the teaching of Jesus was given primarily through Jewish apocalyptic imagery, which formed a screen upon which he could project his conception of the ideal life and the Fatherly will of God; and that the first Christians under the influence of such ideals, gradually and unconsciously borrowed, absorbed, and transformed the popular paganism of the Roman Empire. The Gospel was thus presented first in the setting of Jewish apocalyptic imagery, and then through the medium of popular pagan piety. The complexity and variety of the books of the New Testament is due to this complicated background. They are the product of a particular age, and can only be understood as such. The task of the New Testament scholar is to detach the Gospel from its old and outworn setting, and to effect in our civilization what the ancient Christians did for theirs (chap. iii.). Criticism has discovered the essential Gospel of the New Testament. "We know at last what our religion is based on." Man is a spiritual being, inspired by an ideal of human brotherhood which must be realized in human society. This realization is, however, dependant upon the accepting of the principles of the Sermon on the Mount, which alone form the solid foundations upon which a human

society can rest permanently. This was the essence of the Gospel in the New Testament, this is the essence of the Christian Religion, and this is the religion of the future (chap. iv.).

So the Professor has discovered what he wished to discover, and has presented it to his readers as the result of a life dedicated to the scientific study of the New Testament. To English readers the weakness of the book is obvious. The author has written carefully about the complexity of the New Testament and on what he calls the "time element." But just at the point when the most rigorous and objective analysis is required to answer the question as to what is the element by which the New Testament is held together, what is, in point of fact, the "essential gospel," to use his own phrase, he introduces the ideas and even the phraseology of modern philanthropy. Thus he escapes from being compelled to refer to belief in the supernatural and to eternal life. The Creeds, which he contemptuously and superficially dismisses as outworn philosophy, far more truly point to the essence of the Gospel in the New Testament, than does Dr. Scott's professorial philanthropy. The Son of God came down from heaven, died, and rose again; forgiveness of sin and everlasting life are the fruits of faith in God and in His Son and in the Holy Spirit. If the value of the New Testament be, as Dr. Scott says, to prevent the Gospel being resolved into an allegory of redemption, its value is scarcely maintained by robbing the Gospel of all reference to redemption. The book is a disappointing book from the pen of so able a man. E. C. Hoskyns.

Pentateuchal Criticism. By D. C. Simpson. Second Edition. Oxford Press. 6s. 6d.

Dr. Simpson's excellent little book was published in 1914. Having been out of print for some time it is now reissued by the Oxford Press. It is an excellent statement of the problem for advanced scholars as well as students.

At the beginning of the book we read "this impression has been reproduced photographically by the Muston Company." As this note is likely to appear frequently in future, readers may be interested to be told its significance. Before the War printers were accustomed to allow a publisher to keep the type of a new book standing for some little while. Under the new conditions they find it necessary to charge rent for the standing type. To avoid this the publisher has to decide at an early date, before he knows whether the book will be a success, either to distribute the type or to "mould." If a second edition is required, plates are made from the moulds, a somewhat expensive process. If a third printing is required, and stereoplates are available, the cost of production is comparatively cheap. The new process, sometimes called "anastatic" (the resurrection of a dead book), makes it possible for a publisher in doubtful cases to distribute the type of a new book and avoid either rent of type or cost of moulding. If a reprint is called for, the new process is used. No alterations are possible; even misprints must be reproduced. The tendency will be to add new matter in a new preface or appendix. The moral is that scholars should prepare their work for the press with the utmost care, realizing that it may not be possible to correct mistakes in a second edition. They will be well advised to avoid ephemeral remarks, such as will be unintelligible before long, when writing books intended to be of permanent value. W. K. L. Clarke.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE STATE. By S. Parkes Cadman. Macmillan and Co. 12s.

It is evident that Dr. Parkes Cadman is a man of discursive reading which he had not always kept up to date. The worst of discursive reading means that it leads to discursive thought, and this fault is occasionally evident in this volume. It opens with a consideration of the two voices—that is, the voices of the world and of the Church. The author proceeds to analyse past and present, and though there is nothing novel in his views, it is obvious that they are characterized by sanity of outlook. In the third lecture on the growth and the purpose of the State, we are getting to closer grip with the subject of the book, and the author has something to say concerning the connection between tribalism. In spite of what he writes, we still want an account of the stages of transition from the patriotism of the City-State to that of the Holy Roman Empire. In the first we have long since passed the stage when the tie between men was kinship, not land. Yet all through the Middle Ages there are strange recurrences to the older conceptions. John, for instance, calls himself the King of England, whereas all his predecessors called themselves Kings of the English. It is significant that it is not to the closing years of the sixteenth century that Henry IV. ventured to call himself King of France, not of the French; and we all are aware that in our own day the ex-Kaiser was Emperor of the Germans, not of Germany. Dr. Parkes Cadman is, of course, justified in regarding Erasmus and the humanists as the very embodiment of the spirit of internationalism. Here we pause for a moment. To-day it is the fashion to advocate the League of Nations, and we all recognize that the chief obstacle in its way is the hubris of the different nations. The more we survey the mediæval age, the more we are convinced that it was emphatically the age of internationalism. A knight was bound to a fellow-knight wherever he lived and whatever might be his nascent nationality. There was only one real State, the Holy Roman Empire, and yet the mediæval League of Nations completely broke down. The *tres magi*, as Bacon called them, Henry VII. of England, Louis XI. of France, and Ferdinand the Catholic of Spain, all reigned over lands that were fast assuming a national form. The State, as we know it, was beginning to take shape. Perhaps the most unified part of this book is that which concerns itself with the collapse of mediæval imperialism. In this connection we read much on the divine right of kings. The author rightly traces this far-reaching conception back to the epoch-making work of Marsiglio of Padua, the "Defensor Pacis." It is obvious that the only way to meet one divine right is to assert another. If the Pope claims to be so by right divine, the Emperor must also claim to be so by right divine. Accordingly Marsiglio of Padua works this thesis out, and in a sense he is the father of the State of our time. No doubt there were other progenitors, and Bacon's *tres magi*, and such reformers as Luther and Calvin, and such sovereigns as Henry VIII. and Philip II. dotted the i's and crossed the t's of the "Defensor Pacis." The bibliography to this volume is full, and the index is good. It is a pity, however, that Dr. Parkes Cadman did not give the dates of printing and the places of publication of the books he gives.

R. H. MURRAY.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS. By Étienne Gilson. Translated by E. Bullough, M.A., and edited by the Rev. G. A. Elrington, O.P., D.Sc. Heffers. 7s. 6d.

This is a careful and readable survey of the life and thought of the great master of thirteenth-century thought. The biography is all too short. M. Gilson is more interested in theology, and accordingly he provides us with a reasonable and reasoned summary of the work of St. Thomas Aquinas.

R. H. MURRAY.

BOOK NOTES

Christian Schools and Scholars. Sketches of Education from the Christian Era to the Council of Trent. By Mother Frances Raphael Drane, O.S.D. New edition. Edited by Walter Gumbley, O.P. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 15s. A second edition of this well-known work on Christian education, originally issued in 1867, was prepared by the authoress in 1882. The present editor, taking account of the relevant literature since that date, has carefully revised the book, and presents it now for the further period of use which it is certain to enjoy. Lest the word "sketches" in the subtitle should mislead any who do not know the book, it ought to be said that it runs to 742 pages, and is as thorough as it is entertaining. It will prove a real inspiration to all who are serving Christ in the arduous work of teaching. *The Light of Russia.* An Introduction to the Russian Church. By Donald A. Lowrie. S.C.M. 5s. Writing for American readers, the author of this book presents a survey of the history of the Church in Russia down to the year 1921, and gives an interesting and well-informed account of the faith and religious practice of the Russian people. It should prove a help towards that wider appreciation of the Holy Orthodox Church which is so desirable in this generation. *Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre.* An Historical and Descriptive Handbook. By the Ven. P. Stacy Waddy, M.A. Mowbray. 2s. and 3s. The Archdeacon of the Church of England in Palestine has prepared this illustrated handbook for the use of such as are fortunate enough to be able to visit the Holy Land; but much pleasure may be derived from it also by the many more who have no prospect of making the journey. *The Church Catechism: Its History and Meaning.* By E. Basil Redlich, B.D. Macmillan. 4s. 6d. The history of the Catechism down to 1662 is very clearly and fully stated in this well-arranged and well-documented textbook, which should speedily find its way into general use among students and teachers of the Faith. A single criticism must be offered on a small but important matter. In the last chapter, dealing with the meaning of the Catechism, there is a restrained but none the less unfortunate advocacy of the right of the parish priest to determine the competent age for confirmation, the Bishop being given only "an undefined power to approve or reject." Large issues lie behind this ingenuous statement, and it is very doubtful wisdom thus to whisper encouragement to those of the clergy who would force the hands of the bishops in a matter vitally affecting the ordering of the sacramental life of English Churchpeople. *How to Read the Bible.* By R. G. Moulton. The Macmillan Co. 80c. All who know *The Modern Reader's Bible* will appreciate the necessity of adding this small

handbook to their store of Biblical literature; those who do not yet know it will certainly be led to acquaint themselves with it if they light on this excellent introductory survey. *Interpretations New and Old.* By A. S. Geden. T. and T. Clark. 7s. 6d. The thirteen scholarly meditations on the Word of God contained in this book are sent forth from the study of one who, after doing notable work as Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Literature and of Comparative Religion in the Wesleyan College at Richmond, is now enjoying what he terms "the comparative leisure of old age and retreat." While they will be especially valued by the alumni of the College, they will also commend themselves to many others by the sober thoughtfulness and quiet optimism which pervade them. *Songs of Sorrow and Praise.* Studies in the Hebrew Psalter. By the Rev. Duncan Cameron, B.D. T. and T. Clark. 7s. The matter of his five Hastie Lectures on the Psalter delivered in 1918 is here presented in ten chapters by the Director of Religious Instruction in the Provincial Training College, Edinburgh, who is both a reliable Hebrew scholar and a good teacher. The book is packed with information, and yet is easy reading; it gives a valuable insight into the original text without requiring a knowledge of Hebrew in the reader; and it deals all the time not in a merely general way with a collection of writings known as the Psalms, but with the Songs themselves, which appear on almost every page. This is a wholly admirable introduction to the Psalter. O. H.

Two books deserve a welcome from the band of students, very few among the working clergy, who specialize in Semitic languages. *The Parables and Similes of the Rabbis* (Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.) by Rabbi Feldman sounds interesting, and so it is from the Jewish, as well as from a broadly human, standpoint, but it contains very little to attract the student of the New Testament. As in all Rabbinics, there are too many passages like the following: "On the text 'Thy teeth are as a flock of sheep' [Cant. vi. 6] they [the Rabbis] say: Just as the sheep has an appearance of decency, so were the Israelites chaste and noble during the war with Midian" (p. 224). Dr. W. B. Stevenson's *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic* (Oxford Press. 7s. 6d.) owes much to the Society for Old Testament Study. It may be taken as authoritative, and indispensable to those who would study the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, and the Aramaic portions of the Palestinian Talmud. *Betting and Gambling.* By Peter Green. S. C. M. 1s. 6d. This pamphlet is admirable, as one would expect from the author writing on such a subject. It contains the experience of a parish priest familiar with working-class conditions and embodies important evidence given before the Royal Commission. A most important feature is the discussion of gambling in cotton "futures" and similar commodities, discriminating between speculation which serves a useful social purpose and that which is harmful. *Christian Verity.* By L. Prestige. Anglo-Catholic Congress. 3s. 6d. The committee of the Anglo-Catholic Congress, thinking there is need for a thoughtful presentation of the faith, have arranged for the present attractive little volume. In a series of short chapters Mr. Prestige deals with great subjects in an admirably clear and well-balanced manner. His book will be of great service to a limited class of readers. *The Morality of Birth Control.* Bale and Danielsson. 10s. 6d. This is a technical mono-

graph, by an Anglo-Catholic priest who withholds his name, on *coitus reservatus* and *coitus interruptus*. He criticizes the Roman Catholic teaching that the first is permissible, and the second sinful. One could wish the book were written in Latin, as are most Roman Catholic books which deal with similar subjects. Monographs on details of moral theology are badly needed, but this particular book may do more harm than good by familiarizing the general reader with matters about which he can afford to be ignorant. The book is published by a firm known for its medical books; its subject is not fitted for further discussion here. *The Minister and His Parish.* By H. W. Foote. Macmillan, New York. $1.75. A book of great value to those who study contemporary American religious life. All the details which an American would not think of explaining, because they would be taken for granted, are given here. The town minister should, so this book recommends, have a salary equal to that of a college president, or, at least, the principal of a secondary school, a house provided and kept up, also a room in the Church buildings with modern office equipment and a stenographer, who will take down his sermons from dictation, and present them typed for revision. *Healing.* By M. R. Newbolt. S.P.C.K. 2s. Probably the readers of this admirable little book, which subjects modern claims to a sympathetic but searching examination, will be comparatively few; the enthusiasts will not care for a douche of cold water, and the sceptics will not need such a book. If so, it will be a pity, for it would be difficult to find such good sense combined with knowledge of theology and sympathy with modern movements elsewhere within the compass of ninety pages. *The Doctrine of the Infallible Book.* By C. Gore, D.D. S. C. M. 1s. The Bishop was asked to write this pamphlet in view of the post-war recrudescence of theories of Bible Infallibility which were thought to be dying. Needless to say, it is eminently fitted to put into the hands of students accustomed to approach a subject in a scholarly way. It is noticeable that the Bishop sees no signs of archæology reversing the verdict of literary criticism on the Old Testament documents. He makes an important point when he insists that modern exponents of Biblical Infallibility differ materially from their predecessors in the early Church, who had the allegorical method to save the situation. *The Historical Jesus.* By C. Piepenbring. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d. This is an English translation of a book by a French Protestant pastor, who was born in 1840, and has spent most of his life in Strasbourg. Our Lord becomes here a purely human figure. Christianity is compared with Taoism and Stoicism, with the result that "there is no absolutely essential difference between Biblical and ecclesiastical teaching and the two systems in question" (p. 200). The book is not likely to interest our readers. Its standpoint is not theirs, and if they wish to read books of Unitarian writers, they will prefer first-hand works to popularisations of this kind. *St. Gregory the Great.* By Abbot Snow, O.S.B. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 7s. 6d. A new edition of a book originally published in 1892, describing a saint who has the greatest possible claim on the reverence and gratitude of Englishmen. It is hardly a biography in the modern sense; its value consists in the copious extracts from St. Gregory's letters, the saint thus telling the story largely in his own words.

W. K. L. C.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER.